

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXLII.]

OCTOBER, 1856.

[VOL. XII.

MR. TAYLER ON RELIGION IN GERMANY.

*Heidelberg, Sept. 8th, 1856.*

MY DEAR SIR,

THE picturesque attractions of this part of Germany are so well known to all the world from Hand-books and Tours, that it would be preposterous to attempt another description, even if I had the power to do them justice; but a residence of two months in Heidelberg, and considerable opportunities of intercourse with professors, clergymen and other inhabitants of the place, have enabled me to obtain some insight into the present state of religious opinion and social feeling, which may not be so readily accessible to all your readers; and I venture, therefore, in the hope that a brief account of what I have observed and heard in this respect may interest some of them, to crave a small space in your pages for this and a following number or two of the *Christian Reformer*.

More than twenty years have now elapsed since I first visited Germany, and spent some months both at Göttingen and at Bonn. The long interval has brought about a very perceptible change in the tone of public sentiment concerning religion and religious philosophy, and in the views of some learned men with whom I have conversed as to the treatment of those high questions, which I cannot regard as favourable in its immediate results to religious truth, to mental freedom, and to healthy, quiet, conservative progress. At that time—now almost a quarter of a century ago—Schleiermacher was just dead; Niebuhr and Hegel had been removed from the scene some years earlier; but the influence of their writings and teachings was at its height, and I retain a lively impression of the violent agitation of ideas which it had produced, and of the great division of opinion, especially among the disciples of Hegel and Schleiermacher, as to what they had actually taught, and what was the true construction and application of their doctrines. Lücke, De Wette, Gieseler, Otfried Müller, Heeren, Neander, were still living; old Paulus, the representative of the primitive rationalism of Germany, was still active and zealous in his peculiar, contracted and ever-narrowing sphere; and Strauss's "*Leben Jesu*," which shook the whole theological world like an earthquake, though it was only an explosion of elements that had long been fermenting under Hegelian

influence in the school of Tübingen, and might therefore have been predicted—and of which I well remember Lücke's observing, that it was a phenomenon (*erscheinung*) which *must* come—was only just on the point of publication. If I am not mistaken, the *first* edition appeared early in 1835. At that time, the right of the freest search into theological subjects was maintained by all the men of eminence; *Lehr-freiheit* (freedom in teaching) was cherished as the peculiar privilege of the theological faculties of the German Universities, asserted with equal tenacity by Schleiermacher, their most intellectual and far-seeing, and by Neander, their most devout and conscientious, representative. There seemed then to be widely diffused through the general atmosphere of German thought, a generous faith in truth and all its consequences—a trust, which I cannot but deem essentially a *religious* trust, that if theological criticism and philosophical speculation were only allowed their free course and were prosecuted with earnestness and good faith, they *must*, notwithstanding all temporary appearances of collision,—since God is one and truth is one,—work out finally some grand common result, and bring their joint support to those indispensable convictions in which the human soul finds its only repose and strength. It was in this spirit that Neander, though piously orthodox in his own belief, put forth his noble protest against the suppression of the work of Strauss, and maintained that learning and research like his ought only to be encountered with the same weapons. Many of the most eminent theologians were then, as they are still, and had been from the time of Michaelis and Eichhorn, laymen, and this may have had its effect on the freedom of their inquiries; although their being members of the *theological* faculty might seem to bestow on them a kind of semi-consecration, which distinguished them from *mere* laymen. I remember Lücke in particular (whose mind, notwithstanding its many accomplishments, always seemed to me somewhat timid and irresolute) laying much stress on this last circumstance, as defining the relations of the University to the Church,—a difficult question, which I could already perceive even in those days was beginning to be viewed with considerable uneasiness. Men of a conservative, mediating tendency, like Lücke, regarded the theological faculty as a kind of *tertium quid*, neither quite clerical nor quite laic, but something between the two—enjoying the right of free search and the possession of an *esoteric* doctrine within its own privileged sphere, but bound, out of respect for its great practical ally, the Church, to observe a cautious and prudent reserve towards the external world, and guard from the vulgar eye the most startling results of its inquiries under the veil of a learned language. In full accordance with these views, Lücke argued that Strauss ought to have written his book in Latin; and once, I remember well, when Lachmann, who was a member of the philosophical faculty



and therefore *only* a layman, announced a fresh revision of the text of the New Testament, he expressed his apprehension of this interference with another faculty, and quoted the familiar line of Virgil—

“Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.”

*Mais nous avons changé tout cela.* This state of indecision and uncertainty, which might have subsided under a quiet course of progressive expansion and gradual reforms, and given place to a heartier and more trustful spirit, has completely passed away. Indecision, on the part of the authorities and of a certain portion of the people, is the last thing to be complained of now. The revolutionary events of the years 1848 and 1849 have driven the conflicting elements of public opinion into extremes so wild and unreasonable, that they seem almost to furnish each other with the grounds of a mutual self-justification. The Church, the Universities and the Government, have drawn closer than ever their bonds of union, in a deep and common distrust of the popular feeling and of popular tendencies. There are, of course, many noble exceptions both in Church and in State, and some excellent institutions, working in the interests of truth and freedom, of which I shall speak hereafter. The people, on the other hand, look with an increased suspicion on their legitimate rulers and instructors. They have the feeling, to some degree doubtless unjust, that their teachers do not themselves believe what they teach—that the whole truth has been held back from them; and they fall into the very natural but very mischievous error of distrusting and disbelieving everything. At the present time, among the respectable and educated classes, there is much reserve in the expression of opinion. Government has its hand so directly on all the movements of society, that a man may seriously compromise his position and even endanger his subsistence by an imprudent word or an ill-advised act. Partly from conservative reaction, partly from a real revival of religious feeling, which the dark and anxious prospect of affairs could hardly fail to produce in serious minds, and partly too from deference to the demands of public opinion, the churches are much more frequented, and the whole service has a greater air of seriousness and devotion, than was the case twenty years ago. Many of the clergy, too, are earnest and painstaking, and, I do not doubt, in the main faithful and conscientious, men. Still I find it universally admitted, that among the lower classes in the towns there is great indifference to all religious beliefs and observances, and among the young men of education a wide-spread scepticism about the fundamental truths of religion, and not unfrequently a decided tendency to atheistic materialism. In one of the principal churches of Heidelberg yesterday, during the administration of the Lord's Supper, out of about a hundred communicants, I counted only fifteen men. The other day, in travelling by railway between

Heidelberg and Baden-Baden, I fell into conversation with a young man of some cultivation and of lively, affable manners, who I am afraid, from what I learn, must be taken as a sample of a considerable section of young Germany. He had received a university education, and studied two years in Geneva. He spoke French with as much fluency as German, and passed without difficulty in conversation from one language to the other. But he did not disguise from me that he had no religious belief. He knew of no God apart from the Universe. Everything was materialism, governed by law. Law, as far as I could make out, was with him, "*das Höchste Wesen*" (the Supreme Being). When I spoke of individual immortality as being the steadfast belief of one of his greatest countrymen, Goethe, he perfectly scoffed at the idea, said it was given up by all men of science at the present day, and told me, with great confidence of manner, that Schiller and Goethe were behind the philosophy of the age. If Government repression were withdrawn, a scientific materialism, he assured me, would be the avowed creed of all educated people. And I have little doubt that the present clerical crusade against opinions of a certain kind, does strengthen, and most powerfully, the persuasion that they contain the truth. Every tendency must be suffered to work itself out to its legitimate speculative results, before the elements of truth and falsehood involved in it can be fairly discriminated, and the mischief that might result from its partial expression be effectually repelled. As a contrast with this offspring of a diseased and overwrought civilization, I met one day, in my rambles among the wooded hills that encircle Heidelberg, with a young American, who furnished quite another specimen of humanity. He was the son of a farmer in a remote valley on the western confines of the State of New York, about twelve miles south of Lake Ontario, who had been commissioned by the conductor of an agricultural newspaper in that part of the world, to travel through Europe and furnish him with articles for his journal on the state of industry and cultivation. He had already made a tour on foot through a considerable part of England, Scotland and Ireland; and when I met him had recently arrived in Heidelberg, where he intended to remain and make himself master of the language, and attend some of the scientific classes in the University, and then resume his travels and his periodical reports to his employer. When he first came across my path, I found that he knew not a soul in Heidelberg, and could not speak one word of German. He had brought with him, as his only introduction into society, a sort of general circular from the conductor of the newspaper, attesting his respectability and good talents, and stating the object of his journey. This rencontre brought vividly before me the singular relations of the old and the new world, and set in a striking light the contrasts of character which they exhibit. The young



man was plain and unaffected in his manners, without any tincture of vulgarity; thoroughly healthy in all his sentiments; eager for knowledge; passionately fond of travel; with a natural, practical sense of religion, which resolved itself, without any speculative refinement, into simple obedience to the commands of God. His description of his father's family and farm—its quiet seclusion, its rustic plenty, the simple equality of its intercourse, where master and servants sat down without offence or collision at one table—and of the association of young men from neighbouring farms on occasional winter evenings for mutual improvement, interested me greatly, and had in it a touch of primitive simplicity which recalled some scenes of Acadie in Longfellow's beautiful poem of Evangeline. He spoke of the powerful and beneficial effect of religious revivals on the disposition to spiritual torpor in those sequestered districts. I suspect that he belonged himself to some orthodox denomination, though he told me he disliked religious controversy. The family, he said, had to travel three or four miles over *wooden* roads, which in winter were often impassable, to the nearest church. He mentioned also that in that part of America, among the rising generation, Universalist doctrines were decidedly gaining the ascendancy. I must confess that the comparison in this instance seemed to me favourable to the new world. The young farmer from the valleys of the far West, with all his want of conventional refinement, but with all his moral and religious instincts unblunted, his mind open to knowledge, and freshly alive to all the impressions of nature and the novelties of foreign lands, seemed to me in possession of a far nobler and happier being, than the forced product of our European hot-bed of culture, where intellect had dried up the heart, and left nothing for the soul to subsist upon but the empty formulas of science.

I suppose it must be admitted that theological and philosophical inquiry is now at a stand-still in Germany. Some men of the older schools still prosecute their studies. But no encouragement is given to thoroughly free and honest research. Only one course can lead to promotion. Men of promise who had entered on the theological career, have now abandoned it for other and more profitable pursuits. Many of the rising young men are devoting themselves to the physical sciences, which yield more fruit and threaten less danger. The old philosophical systems which made such a sensation twenty years ago, are all now completely *bankrupt*. Such was the very expression made use of by a learned and enlightened clergyman, with whom I was conversing on the subject the other day. But Hegelianism, though extinct as a school, has left behind it, I am assured, a deep and wide-spread effect which is far from exhausted, and has a large share in producing the tendencies of thought which so extensively prevail. No visible advance, however, is made

towards the settlement of questions which the latest researches had thrown out and strongly put, but left unsolved. A theologian, opposed to Strauss's views, gave it me as his opinion, that, on some very important points, Strauss's criticism of the New Testament history remained where it was, and had yet to be thoroughly answered. Neander's reply is considered a failure. The silence with which the *Leben Jesu* is now passed over, does not indicate its confutation. That is only to be accomplished by a large, many-sided and generous spirit of free inquiry, trustfully surrendering weak points, and maintaining with proportionate tenacity the strongholds of fundamental religious truth. It is of no use to assail his criticism in detail, some of which it is very difficult to meet, and which only combined and systematized much that had already been advanced by others; but the force of the attack should be directed against the mistaken *ground-view* of the whole subject, and the radically false religious philosophy on which his criticism is based, and out of which all that is dangerous and pernicious in it really springs. This is just the course which is not taken by the present conservative party, and which can alone protect and deliver Christianity amidst the perils to which it is exposed. Encouraged by the extremes into which men rushed during the frenzy of revolutionary excitement, and making good use of some acts of folly which have deprived both the German Catholics and the Free Protestant congregations of much of the sympathy and support which they had previously possessed,—the Church authorities, especially in Prussia, with such men as Hengstenberg and Stahl at their head, are using their utmost efforts to suppress every free and popular movement of religious life, and, with the aid of a resuscitated sacerdotalism, utterly alien from the principle of genuine Protestantism, are trying to restore a hard and rigid confessionalism, which will shut up once more the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches within their own narrow doctrinal limits, and congeal the brave and generous spirit of the first Reformers in the cold intellectual systems of the theologians of the seventeenth century. The people are to have no voice in religious matters. The rights of the congregation, on which all true Christian life must be based, are ignored. The minds of children are to be dosed in catechisms with doctrinal formulas, instead of being nourished with the living spirit of Christianity. Schools are to be brought more strictly under clerical supervision and control; and the clergy themselves are to be bound more closely than ever to the letter of confessional subscription, and confined in their course of public instruction to the rigid line of traditional orthodoxy. Such are the prospects open to candidates for the Christian ministry. The consequences are such as might be expected. The number of candidates diminishes. Minds of a high order shrink from so ignoble a service. Only the lectures



of orthodox professors are thronged, for they only can furnish their hearers with the needful requirements for examination. An artificial zeal may sometimes be produced by the constant application of a given stimulus. As among the Puseyite party in England, the present race of theological students in Germany, as I was informed by a very intelligent young Independent minister who had attended the classes at Berlin, are beginning to be infected with a sort of disinterested ardour for these narrow views, and are many of them sincere and zealous in professing them. The mental atmosphere constantly breathed acts at length on the constitution of the mind itself, and deteriorates its quality and tone. From the same source I also learned that the prevalence of unbelief among the young laity was fearful. What a melancholy social condition! The clergy chained up by a fanatical reaction to the powerless, soulless forms of a past generation! The young life of the laity running wild and reckless in the desolate spaces of a dreary, godless nihilism! No exchange of thought and sympathy between those whose high mission it is to teach, and those whose privilege it ought to be to learn! Can anything be more suicidal than the policy which produces such fruits as these? When the time for reaction comes, as come it must, the havoc will be frightful indeed. Much will go that the best men would gladly preserve;—some of the noblest sentiments and best affections of our nature will be crushed for a time in the general mass of ruin. In such a state of things, it is happy for Germany that there are still a few men left to raise up their voices boldly for the truth. As a layman and a politician of high social position, M. Bunsen, now resident in Heidelberg, possesses a great personal influence, which he employs nobly, by his voice and his pen, in asserting the rights of the Christian congregation against the pretension of the priest, and breaking through, by his own writings, the exclusive monopoly of the theologians. I have remarked, on more than one occasion, that by the men of *Fach* he is regarded with some jealousy, and even spoken of slightly, as an invader of their peculiar province. But the mass of the unlearned laity are with him; and, in spite of occasional errors of scientific detail, in which his sanguine temperament, his confiding sympathies, and his too great facility of generalization, may sometimes expose him to the attacks of the hypercritical, his great knowledge, his wide experience, his comprehensive views, and his large and generous heart, with which that of Arnold so warmly sympathized, will enable him to render vast service to the highest interests of humanity, and become a benefactor to his country in her deepest need. He has not lived so long in England without learning much that will benefit Germany. May God speed him in his noble work!

J. J. TAYLER.

## PROFESSOR HUNTINGTON'S SERMONS.\*

DR. HUNTINGTON is one of the most popular American preachers of the present day,—popular in his mode of address, and in his very nature. He kindles the imagination and warms the heart; and he possesses “a matchless voice and elocution, that would invest with a charm the utterance of the multiplication-table or the alphabet of the most unknown tongue, and would draw admirers to the preaching of Hindooism or Wakanism.”† He received his theological education at the Divinity School in Cambridge, Mass.; and went thence, in 1842, to take the charge of the South Congregational church, Boston. For some years Mr. Huntington was one of the editors of the Boston Christian Register,‡ and has for a longer period edited the Monthly Religious Magazine, an interesting and popular periodical. Through these channels and through his oratorical gifts, he has acquired a wider influence than many American divines with whose writings we are better acquainted.§

The office which he holds at Cambridge is a new one. Harvard College, though originally designed to promote religion, has become secularized through an extreme respect for religious liberty. No person is allowed to “hold any executive office in the College who has the pastoral care of a church, the church of the University excepted.” This exception was in favour of the Hollis|| Professor of Divinity, who was regarded as having the pastoral oversight of the University; but since the death of Dr. Ware (the father of the Revds. H. and W. Ware) this office has remained vacant, owing, we believe, to the strong protests of an orthodox minority to the appointment of a Unitarian. The students have therefore been left without any authorized pastor for many years; though the daily public worship in the College chapel has been regularly conducted by professors of the Divinity School, who have, however, no official connection with the College. To remedy this evil, a new professorship, of Christian Morals, has been established by private munificence, on the

---

\* Sermons for the People. By F. D. Huntington, D.D., Preacher to the University, and Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in the College, at Cambridge. Boston and Cincinnati (U.S.). Pp. 468. 1856.

† Christian Register, July 26, 1856.

‡ We see in the last number of the Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association, that the Committee of the Association are promptly taking steps towards effecting a union of the Christian Register and the New York Christian Inquirer.

§ He republished Mr. Mountford's Martyria, with an Introduction; and his editorial influence helped to procure a very high appreciation for that work. The Martyria, and the beautiful book which followed it, Euthanasia, are far better known in America than in England.

|| So called after a liberal English Dissenter, a great benefactor to Harvard College.



duties of which Dr. Huntington entered last session. He is professor in the "*College*," which is for undergraduates in Arts, and preacher to the "*University*," which comprises, in addition, the schools of Law, Medicine, Divinity and Science; altogether, we suppose, about 600 young men, the hope of New England. We hardly know a more responsible and influential position. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Huntington speak warmly of his qualifications for the office. He has a manliness of bearing, a frankness of disposition, and a warmth of heart, which young men can appreciate; while they cannot but admire his talents and attainments, and respect the excellence and earnestness of his character.

We have read through the twenty-six sermons contained in this volume with great interest. The titles of them will suggest their prevailing tone:—1. Our Christian Faith, a Reality. 2. Reality in Religious Manifestations. 3. Asking and Receiving. 4. The Soul's Search. 5. The Soul's Coronation (the spiritual nature to be paramount). 6. Homeward Steps (seven stages of spiritual pilgrimage to the Father's house). 7. Holiness to the Lord. 8. Satan Transformed. 9. Four Apostles (Peter, Paul, James and John—examples of zeal, faith, morality and love). 10. Acceptance of the Heart. 11. Woman's Position. 12. The Christian Woman. 13. The Law of the House. 14. Children—how to be Received. 15. Entrance into the Church. 16. Trials of Faith. 17. Salvation not from Suffering, but by it. 18. Divinity of Christ. 19. Doctrine of the Spirit. 20. The Soul's Dependence on Christ, and Victory by him. 21. The Hidden Life. 22. Spiritual Heirship. 23. The Religion that is Natural (i.e. supernatural, as became a religion coming from above, but natural in its working). 24. Foundations of a Christian City. 25. National Retribution, and the National Sin (after the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law). 26. The Word of Life: a Living Ministry and a Living Church.

The last discourse was addressed to the Meadville Theological School, and describes what we believe to be his own aim:

"The office of the ministry is to produce this Life—to take up and carry forward, in man's behalf, Christ's reconciling work; by whatever methods, according to whatever theory; by communication and by incitement; by rousing and kindling the dormant capacities of the soul, and by taking the things of the Spirit and shewing them; life, at all events, and at all cost,—life as opposed to stupor, half-belief, spiritual indifference, or a heart split between God's worship and mammon worship,—life, not death."—P. 447.

Most of this volume appears to us as true as it is earnest. There are other portions which are equally earnest, but in our opinion very far from the truth. Whilst we would gladly enrich our pages with many brilliant, fervent and beautiful passages, it seems incumbent upon us to select for our review those doctrinal

statements which are certainly startling, considering the position of the speaker.

His 18th sermon, on the "Divinity of Christ," contains an unmistakeable avowal of belief in our Saviour's proper Deity :

"There are two prevalent apprehensions of the character and office of Jesus as Saviour of the world. One contemplates him as specially appointed to represent the perfection of humanity, meaning by humanity what we have hitherto known or conceived of the spiritual powers and possibilities in a human being. This view holds Jesus to have been a perfect man; the completest moral example and religious genius of our race; exhibiting in his life and death the utmost that human excellence can do or be; as shewing the ultimate achievement, thus far at least, of a man's virtue, love and faith; and as having withdrawn his personal presence and power from the world at his ascension, so that the communion of his followers is not literally a communion *with him*, but is only a commemorative observance for a Teacher living on earth in the past, but retired now into the heavens.

"The other view regards Christ as shewing forth not only a perfect humanity, but also and primarily God himself; representing God to man, as well as man to himself; being the express image of God's person; being God in the act and character of revealing or manifesting himself, creating and saving the world; separate at no point from God's sovereignty, nor knowing in his divinity any limitation or abridgment from the fulness of God; exhibiting, as in God's behalf, through a union of nature with the Father not explicable to us, the Divine attributes; and reconciling alienated souls by manifesting God in his flesh. According to this doctrine, he survives in his church to this day, and will survive, not only by influence and memory, but by the presence of his person; a distinct and everlasting person in himself, without beginning of days or end of years, the same yesterday, to-day and for ever.

"The latter of these two views appears to me not only incomparably the most benignant and precious, but to stand towards the other in the relation of truth to error; to be charged with inestimable blessings to our religious progress; to be liable to fewer theological perversions, and less dangerous abuses; and to need also that it be more distinctly asserted and impressed on our present habits of thinking, especially among the inquiring and the young."—Pp. 252—254.

The Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association says,

"By most of his readers he will be understood as alluding to the common Unitarian and Orthodox view of Christ. It is of this we complain. His first described view is not the Unitarian view. Mr. Huntington preaches in our pulpits; probably all the discourses in this volume have been delivered to large Unitarian audiences; and no man knows better than the Plummer Professor that there is in our churches a decided rejection of the extreme humanitarian and bald rationalistic theory which he here presents. The fact is so obvious and notorious, that we are forced to conclude that the writer meant to describe only opinions, not parties; beliefs, not denominations; opposite poles of thought, not 'existing postures of sects;' though, by the manner in which he introduced his subject, and a want of care in clearly stating his point, he



has left a cruelly unjust impression on the reader's mind."—Vol. III. p. 637.

Although what is called the Humanitarian theory has prevailed among English Unitarians, this is certainly no accurate statement of it; yet it will not apply to Antisupernaturalists who do not regard Jesus as their Saviour, nor believe in his ascension, nor eat and drink "*in remembrance*" of him, as Christ enjoined on his apostles; nor, we suppose, do they hold our Lord to have been a perfect man, as there are many departments of "human excellence" in which others have displayed more "genius."

We think that Dr. Huntington ought not to have published on this subject without studying the statements of a writer who has probably as deep and wide an influence in America as at home: Mr. Martineau, in his lecture in the Liverpool Controversy, entitled, "The Proposition 'that Christ is God' proved to be false from the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures," wrote as follows:

"The power of Christ's religion is not in his precepts, but in his person; not in the memory of his maxims, but in the image of Himself. \* \* The person of Christ may be contemplated as an object of religious reverence, or as an object of moral imitation. He may appear to our minds as the representative of Deity, or as the model of humanity. \* \* A Christianity which should reduce him to this [latter] relation, would indeed be a step removed above the mere cold preceptive system, which depresses him into a lawgiver; but it would no more be entitled to the name of a *religion*, than the Ethics of Aristotle, or the Offices of Cicero. It is then as the type of God, the human image of the everlasting Mind, that Christ becomes an object of our *faith*. Once did a dark and doubting world cry, like Philip on the evening of Gethsemane, 'Shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;' but now has Christ 'been so long with us,' that we, 'who have seen him, have seen the Father.' This I conceive to have been the peculiar office of Jesus; to *show us*, not to *tell us*, the spirit of that Being who spreads round us in Infinitude, and leads us through Eternity. The universe had prepared for us the *scale* of Deity; Christ has filled it with his own *spirit*; and we worship now, not the cold intellectual deity of natural religion; not the distant majesty, the bleak immensity, the mechanical omnipotence, the immutable stillness of the speculative Theist's God: but One far nearer to our worn and wearied hearts; One whose likeness is seen in Jesus of Nazareth, and whose portraiture, suffused with the tints of that soul, is impressed upon creation. \* \* In order to fulfil this office of revealing, in his own person, the character of the Father, Christ possessed and manifested all the *moral* attributes of Deity. \* \* God can have no other, and no more, perfection of character intelligible to us."—Pp. 4—6.

We do not accept this statement, without the subsequent qualification, that there are properties peculiar to a Creator and to a creature, and that the trustful piety and submission of Jesus is of course not to be attributed to the Almighty; and, in me-

mory of what our Lord said of his words, that they are spirit and life (John vi. 63), we believe that the power of his religion is to be found in his precepts, *as well as* in his person; but Dr. Huntington ought not to have represented the rejectors of Christ's deity as maintaining what they so distinctly oppose. Indeed, those who only read this extract from the Professor's sermon might imagine that he himself holds the view Mr. Martineau advocates, with an Arian addition. Considering what a speck our world is in the universe, there is nothing derogatory to the Father's supremacy to believe that Jesus, if he pre-existed in glory, was entrusted with the creation of the world,—a work of less sublimity than the spiritual creation we ascribe to him. And if Jesus is a distinct person, "*the same* yesterday, to-day and for ever," it is obvious that he must be the "Son of Man" in heaven as he was on earth: this text (Heb. xiii. 8) entirely opposes the hypothesis which makes him a purely divine person before his incarnation, and a god-man after it; while the description, "without beginning of days or end of years" ["life," Heb. vii. 3], is written, not of God, but of Melchisedek, the priest to whom Abraham paid tithes! Subsequent passages prove decisively, what this leaves ambiguous, that Prof. Huntington believes our Lord to be not only a bright manifestation of the Father, but a person of the Godhead.

Unitarians are accustomed to claim the texts in which Jesus is spoken of as the Son of God and the image of God; for these expressions are applied to men, and never to the Supreme Jehovah. Man was made in the "image and likeness"\* of God (Gen. i. 26, 27, v. 1, ix. 6); and the apostle Paul refers to this as a reason why a man was not to cover his head in the church (a sign of submission), "forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God" (1 Cor. xi. 7). The places are numerous in which Jews are spoken of as children and sons of God. No doubt the conception of God was far lower in primitive times than it is now; but as the idea of God rises, so does that of man: Jesus, who reveals the infinite holiness and goodness of God, is the one to make us feel our kindred with an intimacy of relation never before experienced. "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them which believe on his name" (John i. 12). "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. iv. 6). Dr. Channing, who was remarkable for his elevated conceptions of God, is no less distinguished for the earnestness with which he pleads for the infinity of the human soul, and the likeness to God to which we must aspire. When a Christian, therefore, speaks of Christ's humanity, he is not to be understood as degrading him to an antichristian level,

---

\* The same expression that is used of Seth, as the son of Adam, Gen. v. 3.



but as speaking of him in that nature, the divinity of which Jesus has himself revealed.

Dr. Huntington, however, chooses to take *figuratively*, as a "certain liberal use of language," whatever is said of the divine nature of man, and *literally* whatever is said of the divine nature of Christ. "Christ is as distinct from us, as the spiritual nature in us is from the perishable, as God is from man" (p. 258).

"We are encouraged, it is true, to call ourselves children of the Most High; but if we call ourselves so in an humble temper, remembering what sins penitence has to deplore, we shall never confound *our* filial relations with that of him who could utter the sublime and mysterious challenge both to philosophy and faith, 'I and my Father are one.' 'Behold,' says an apostle, 'now are we the sons of God.' But it must be an irreverent self-conceit and a shallow insight that can mistake this thankful confession for a bold assertion of the believer's equality with him, whom the Church and the Gospel unite in revering as THE SON of God, and who received that majestic anointing and seal upon his authority, when the spirit descended visibly upon him in Jordan, and a voice said, 'This is my Beloved Son; hear him.' 'Only-begotten Son,' it is written; what means that significant word, 'only-begotten,' if Jesus is not a Son in some sense in which we are not, and never can be, sons?" P. 259.

The last question Dr. Huntington may answer for himself, if he will look at his Lexicon. We make no bold assertion of equality with Jesus because we share his nature: in our penitence, we willingly believe that there may be countless myriads who are as far his inferiors as our superiors; yet it is by comparing ourselves with the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ as a perfect man (Ephes. iv. 13), that we gain the deepest sense of our own imperfection and sin. "The disciple is not above his master; but every one that is perfect shall be as his master" (Luke vi. 40). Perfect Christians sin not (1 John iii. 9); are the light of the world (Matt. v. 14); have an unction (*chrisma*) from the Holy One, and know all things (1 John ii. 20); have received of Christ's fulness, even grace for grace (John i. 16); are filled with all the fulness of God (Ephes. iii. 19); are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ (Rom. viii. 17). Can our author forget the prayer in John xvii., or suppose that our Lord besought an absurd impossibility when he implores for believers (vers. 22, 23), "that they may be one, *even as we are one*. I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent me, *and hast loved them as Thou hast loved me*."

An old Unitarian writer\* reckons that there are forty parties at least on the subject of the Trinity and Incarnation. We do not know that Dr. Huntington belongs to any of them; he does not mention the words Unitarian or Trinitarian in the course of

---

\* Unitarian Tracts, Vol. II., "A Letter of Resolution," &c., p. 10.

this sermon; and though he holds the personal deity of Christ, he may not perhaps be equally orthodox on other points. We may specify four views of Christ's deity. (1) The Swedenborgians, who are an increasing body, we believe, in America, hold that there is but one person in the Godhead, and that Jesus was he. (2) The Sabellians believe in one God, having three persons—using *person* in its primitive Latin sense of aspect, or character. Christ is a manifestation of God in his second, or redeeming, person. (3) The second of the Thirty-nine Articles says,—

“The Son, which is the word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood—were joined together in one Person, never to be divided; whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried,” &c.

But (4) some believe that the very God cannot be said to have truly suffered, to have been crucified, dead and buried; but only the human nature of Jesus, which was complete in itself, and was united in one person with the divine nature which retained its perfection.\*

We have often thought that there were some points of resemblance between this last view and Unitarianism; and we find that the learned Arian, Dr. Price, notices the analogy as an instance that extremes meet.† Jesus is man, but the words are dictated, the works performed, by God; and sometimes it is a little uncertain what proceeds from his human nature, and what from the indwelling God. But we cannot agree with Dr. Price, that “as far as Trinitarians and Socinians have ideas, they are agreed, on this subject;” for the Trinitarian hypothesis *invents* a *God the Son*, of whom Scripture never once speaks, which invention causes inextricable perplexities and absurdities; while the Unitarian reverently accepts our Lord's own declaration, that it is the *Father* who dwelleth in him. No one, we suppose, takes the expression, that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily in Christ, so literally as to exclude God from all other persons and places; only the Trinitarian, when under the influence of his theory, defines the amount—it was God the Son, precisely one-third of the Godhead; the Unitarian is content to leave it where Scripture leaves it—while the Father was dwelling in Christ in such fulness as has never been seen before or since, He was also dwelling in all who loved Him, and in the vast universe of worlds, of whose existence knew no man, no, not the Son. As the Unitarian does not believe Jesus to have been an incarnate angel, he

---

\* Vide “The Proper Humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ”—Liverpool Controversy.

† Vide Sermons on Christian Doctrine, 1787, p. 88. See also Dr. Bruce's Sermons on the Bible, 1824, p. 110.



may readily accept Dr. H.'s statement—"That in Christ which is not human is God,—verily, literally and strictly God; as truly God, and in the same sense God, as the Father is God" (p. 264);—far *more* truly, we add, than that there is any second person of the Trinity—God the Son.

Our author, however, is not content with this view. He accepts the third we mentioned; at least, so it seems to us, though we learn that in America his doctrine is accounted Sabellianism:

"What was wanted was a Saviour coming forth out of the Godhead, 'very God of very God' [Nicene Creed], at once divine in his nature and human in his sympathies, to restore, to redeem, to rescue man from himself,—to heal a fatal alienation, to put lost man and the Holy Father at one again. Who else but God manifest in human flesh was competent to this? While accomplishing it, is it very strange that he should sometimes speak of himself, in this condescending and peculiar office, as *unable* to know or to do certain things as of himself without the Father, with whom he ever dwells in perfect oneness, each in each; or that in this human sojourn he should declare himself dependent on that whole and undivided Deity, that entireness of the Godhead, from which he came forth into the world? For that also, and for all the blessed spiritual comfort, light, strength, hope, assurance, promise, salvation, it gives us, let us be humbly and most devoutly thankful. And let us look reverently up to that Lord and Redeemer who in the beginning 'was God,'—who left the Father's bosom for our deliverance from the law of sin and death,—who hath ascended up where he was before,—who has put it past all doubt or question that he and his Father are one,—and who with that Father reigns in consubstantial glory, ever one God, world without end."—Pp. 267, 268.

"How it could be that he who was in the beginning with God, and 'was God,' should yet enter a child's frame, be born of a woman, be made under the Law, pass through a mortal experience, eat and sleep, be tempted, and pray and die; in what manner it was that he who thus shews himself eternally one with the Father could voluntarily veil some things, as it were, from his own mind, and, in the wonderfulness of his condescension and the humility of his Sonship, lay aside for a time not only 'the glory that he had before the world was,' but his vision of some things that the Father hath hid in his own power;—these are secrets. I cannot fathom them. Let me say, I rejoice that I cannot."—P. 266.

Here we have it distinctly stated that he who was God was born, slept, veiled some things from his own mind, and died. We are reminded of Bishop Hall's contemplation,—

"He for whom heaven is too strait, whom the heaven of heavens cannot contain, lies in the strait cabin of the womb, and when he would enlarge himself for the world is not allowed the room of an inn. \* \* \* Only the poor beasts gave way to the God of all the world; it is the great mystery of godliness, that God was manifested in the flesh, and seen of angels; but here, which was the top of all wonders, the very beasts might see their Maker; for those spirits to see God in the flesh, it was not so strange, as for the brute creatures to see Him which was the God of spirits."

When what appear to us contradictions seem to our theological opponents mysteries essential to godliness, and our *reductio ad absurdum* is to them a *reductio ad fidem*, there can be scarcely any ground on which we can meet for argument. The arena is sand indeed!

Dr. Huntington chooses to keep out of view the Unitarian faith as set forth by our most eminent writers in the present day, and seems to fancy that he maintains his position by assailing the doctrine that Christ was merely human. To this, he says,—

"I raise a threefold objection. And I urge that objection by an appeal to the grand, threefold source, where alone we can apply for a final decision: the Word, or the New-Testament writings; History, or the organic working of Christian life through the Church; and the Soul, with its best intuitions and its wants."—P. 254.

Of course nothing is easier than to quote words which could not have been spoken of "an extraordinary mortal, constituted and endowed no otherwise than as you are and I am."

"But I must add here a few of the weighty declarations of Jesus himself, so grand, so comprehensive, so clear and unhesitating, so almost overwhelming in the solemn awe they awaken while we read, that to suppose them uttered by any being not divine, not an eternal dweller in the very bosom and Sonship of the Father, would seem a strange infatuation. 'All power is given unto me, *in heaven and on earth.*' 'All things that the Father hath are mine.' 'Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me.' 'He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.' 'I and my Father are one.' 'The Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son.' 'If ye shall ask anything in my name, *I will do it.*' 'As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father.' 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' 'I give unto them eternal life.' 'No man taketh my life from me; I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.' ['This commandment have I received of my Father.'] 'No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven.' As sure as words have any meaning, these are not the words of a man. They are the words of God."—P. 256.

It seems to us "a strange infatuation" that our author should select the words of the "Son of Man" as those which could *not* be uttered by man. And all the other texts, viewed in their connection, confirm our belief that all the power was bestowed on Christ by One who can endow whom He will, angel or man, with whatever authority is needed to accomplish His purposes of love and wisdom. Our Lord thus describes himself (John viii. 40): "A man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God." A few verses after he has told us that the Father committeth all judgment unto the Son, he adds (John v. 30), "I can of my own self do nothing; as I hear, I judge; and my judgment is just, because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." We regret that Dr. Huntington seems to prefer the interpretation put by the Jewish slanderers



on the words, "I and my Father are one," to the answer which our Lord himself makes to their calumny (John x. 30—36).

After this specimen of argument, we are scarcely surprised to find our Lord's miracles and resurrection alleged as proofs of his deity (p. 260); though Scripture always so expressly assures us that God raised up Jesus, and his miracles were not so stupendous as those related of Moses; and he says himself, "Verily, verily, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto my Father" (John xiv. 12).

Dr. H. does not, however, expect to convince Unitarians till their logical faculty is dissolved by some special exigency:

"I am not unfamiliar with the several interpretations affixed to the passages cited, by those who would discharge them of the contents I have found in them, and reduce them to a consistency with the Humanitarian or Arian theory. It is doubtful, judging by experience, whether it avails much to undertake a refutation of these interpretations in detail, before the heart, by another and a surer process, is brought to an inevitable persuasion of their insufficiency. They will satisfy, till some special exigency of spiritual experience dissolves them in its potent alembic; and then they look as unengaging to the affections, as they do forced and unnatural to the understanding."—P. 265.

We have endeavoured to put our readers in possession of Prof. Huntington's views as to the deity of Christ. We have perused his sermon on the "Doctrine of the Spirit" without any very distinct impression. He says that the term Holy Ghost, or Spirit, is applied earlier in the Scriptures to the "ordinary influence of the Almighty energy," but that the coming of the Paraclete is inseparably connected with the mediatorial office of Christ. He does not appear to maintain the orthodox idea of the Holy Ghost as a person of the Godhead, but represents it as a divine Agent, the chief use of which is to bring the presence of the Father and the Son; yet his doctrine offers no violence to the peculiar culture and affinities of those whose thought turns less to the person of either the Father or the Son, than to that Divine Paraclete proceeding from them both (p. 283).

We wait for Dr. Huntington's own declaration before we call him a Trinitarian; yet it is obvious that he does not hold the sole unity of God even the Father. Perhaps he accords with those who tell us, that they are the true Unitarians who hold the unity of the Son with the Father. If Scripture were silent or ambiguous, we might not lay any extreme stress on the *numerical* unity of God. Were we to choose, we should infinitely prefer a million gods, all acting in the perfect harmony of love,—one in purpose, in character, and in unerring wisdom,—to a single God with no unity of purpose, but with a million conflicting moods. But the alternative is not presented to us: the FATHER, who has all perfection in and of Himself, who is

One with a oneness which no creature can conceive, is distinctly declared to be the ONLY TRUE GOD. The contrasts which many Trinitarians daringly draw between the Father's wrathful justice and the Son's love, are not presented in this book: the scriptural view seems adopted, that man is to be reconciled to God,—though on this topic we are to expect another volume. The scriptural doctrine that prayer is to be offered to the *Father*, is also maintained. Our author, like many Arians, keeps closer to our Saviour's teaching in this respect than the Socinians did.

Considering the high authority which he attaches to Scripture, we think it strange that he persists in asserting that Christ could not perform his various offices except as God, when there is not one of them but what we are distinctly told that it was as a man that he fulfilled them. The apostle explicitly says that the Mediator between God and man is, not the God-man (or even the Lord), but *the man* Christ Jesus (1 Tim. ii. 5). When (Rom. v. 11) he tells us that we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement,\* he leaves us in no doubt as to Christ's nature; for he proceeds to compare him with Adam: by one man's offence death reigned, "by *one man*, Jesus Christ," the free gift abounded. (Christ had not to reconcile God as well as man, but man only.) By man came death, by *man* came also the resurrection of the dead (1 Cor. xv.); and the *man* whom God ordained was to judge the world. If in his mediatorial† character he was man, so also as an intercessor and advocate. The great orthodox churches, in the offices they ascribe to saints and martyrs, shew the craving of the heart for *human* intercessors; though indeed our Lord says, "At that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you that I will pray the Father for you, for the Father himself loveth you," &c. (John xvi. 26).

If Christ came to shew us the Father, it seems that we are not in the Way, but far from it, when our minds are misled in the search for a God the Son, who voluntarily veils some things from his own mind before he speaks, so as to mislead his hearers into a notion of his imperfect goodness, knowledge and power! Those who will not receive Jesus as the Revealer of God, unless Godhead is ascribed to him, remind us of his own words (John v. 43): "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." Dr. Channing, in his sermon on Love to Christ, shews that this love depends very little on our conception of his rank in the scale of being. It seems to us that Dr. Huntington shews no more love or true honour to Christ, than many whose views

---

\* The same word as *reconciled*, the verse before.

† "In his *mediatorial character*, in which he assumed the manhood for our redemption, he was obviously inferior to the Father—he came as a servant to do his Father's will."—Unitarianism Confuted, Liverpool, p. 242.



appear far more scriptural; but that he has a less sublime conception of God, and of the capabilities of those whom He calls His children.

Within the brief limits of this review, we do not profess to give a full delineation of his doctrines; though we have desired, as far as possible, that he should speak for himself; still less have we recorded the many thoughts which they, and especially the mode of their advocacy, suggested to us. We cannot attempt to give an account of the other discourses, which we have read over with much interest, and which, in the midst of their great merits, shew some of the defects which we have already marked. He allows his fancy and his feelings to run away with him. There are many careless expressions which are scarcely becoming in the published discourses of a University preacher. We will illustrate our meaning with a few examples from a single discourse—"Four Apostles." After telling us that Christianity is not a "disobliging" system, he remarks:

"God shows the world the fulness of his great historical ideas, and pushes forward the plans of his providence, by bringing upon the grand theatre a multiplicity of nations," &c.—P. 117.

The following sentence is not grammatical:—

"The points that I would have fasten your attention especially are these."—P. 119. [The points to (*or*, *by*) which I would fasten your attention; *or*, would have you fasten, &c. ?]

He gives Tradition the same authority as Scripture in saying,

"Considering too that Simon Peter was summoned to follow his Master when he was already somewhat advanced in years."—P. 119.

Peter could not have been old, if he wrote his Epistle, as tradition also intimates, more than thirty years after our Lord's crucifixion.

Compare the following descriptions (the *italics* are ours):

"It was he that cried out in an abundance of self-confidence almost childish, when he saw Jesus walking on the waves, 'Let me come unto thee on the water;' but the next moment, by a revulsion as rapid, *screamed*, 'Lord, save me, *for I sink!*'"—P. 120.

"And Peter answered him and said, 'Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water.' And he said, 'Come.' And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water to go to Jesus. But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, 'Lord, save me!'" (Matt. xiv. 28—30.)

He tells us that Peter had "fortitude enough to draw his sword." Rashness is not fortitude. Again:—

"When that burning fiery spirit took the steady poise of principle, \* \* it made him the first to *spring down* into the empty tomb, out of which his Lord had risen."—P. 122.

Scripture informs us that John outran Peter, who however went into the sepulchre, &c. John is the more hasty in this instance, Peter the most investigating.

He says,

"If we had known Peter in his house, we should probably have overheard him retorting angrily to his housemate, or giving some unreasonable indulgence to Petronica, his daughter. The place is nothing, and does not much vary the temptation (?)."—P. 123.

*Housemate* is a strange word to us; it sounds like *housemaid*, but probably means *helpmate*, or wife. The Bible speaks of Peter's wife, but says nothing of Petronica. Baronius, however (a writer of the sixteenth century), mentions Petronilla.

We had marked a few other passages in the same discourse, shewing a want of accuracy and truthful simplicity; and in this volume the vulgar error is repeated, that Mary Magdalene was the woman that had been a sinner who anointed our Lord's feet, —a mistake into which no careful reader of Scripture should fall, and a College Professor ought to know something of Dr. Lardner's decisive Letter to Jonas Hanway. (Works, Vol. XI. pp. 253—264, 1788.)

Our English readers may feel some surprise at the way in which this volume has been received by our American brethren. The Christian Register says,—

"We derive so much satisfaction from the good influence he is exercising among our sons at the University, and hold his personal character in such high respect, that we should be glad if he could make all those young men very much like himself, Sabellianism and all."

The Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association remarks that his "great ability is not in the realm of thought or doctrine, of metaphysics or theology;" but thinks the volume will produce an excellent practical effect; and, except for his misrepresentations, would not have alluded to his speculations as to Christ's nature, "for the whole matter is above human comprehension, and one man's theory is no better than another's." If Unitarianism is not "the doctrine of the gospel," and is a mere theory, no better than the Athanasian Creed, we should fancy the occupation of the Association gone. Certainly we do not understand how Dr. Huntington, with his present views, can take part with Unitarians in their Autumnal and other Conventions. It only proves the practical inefficiency of doctrinal names. We are not, however, disposed to accuse him of any inconsistency in expressing these sentiments as preacher to the University. Though the Unitarians have a Divinity School attached to it, the University is not a Unitarian foundation; it was originally established by Trinitarians, though it has been largely endowed by our body; the young men attending it are of every shade of belief, and those whose consciences forbid are not required to attend the preaching at the chapel. As we before noticed, Dr. Huntington seems to confine his prayers to the Father, to whom all Christians pray. He has not been reserved in his expressions of opinion, and was not elected under false pretences. Nor do



we condemn him for preaching thus in the South Congregational Church. American Congregationalism is no more doctrinal than English Presbyterianism. The heterodox Congregationalists were not willing to be excluded from brotherhood by the orthodox, and for some public purposes the two sections still unite. When Dr. Channing preached on the Great Purpose of Christianity, at the installation of Dr. Huntington's predecessor (the Rev. M. I. Motte, the first minister of that church), he said,—

“I indeed take cheerfully the name of a Unitarian, because unwearied efforts are made to raise against it a popular cry; and I have not so learned Christ, as to shrink from reproaches cast on what I deem his truth. Were the name more honoured, I should be glad to throw it off; for I fear the shackles which a party connexion imposes. I wish to regard myself as belonging, not to a sect, but to the community of free minds, of lovers of truth, of followers of Christ, both on earth and in heaven.”—*Maclellan's edition*, I. 604.

In that community we would meet Dr. Huntington, holding as we do (*vide last C. R. p. 572*) “the great Protestant principle, that the right of private judgment is paramount to the profession of any particular theological tenets.”

We look on the action and reaction in our denomination with no undue anxiety. We think that, in the revulse against Athanasianism and Calvinism, assertions have been made which do not contain the whole truth, and have been greatly perverted. It has long appeared to us that there is a region of doctrine between Orthodoxy and Unitarianism which has not received its fair share of cultivation; and if we rejoice in the tendency of many of our Trinitarian brethren to occupy it, we must not complain if some of our own small band go back to meet them. If they gather there any good fruits which we have neglected, we will thankfully receive them at their hands; meanwhile, we press on, as we hope, to more perfect views of the truth as it is in Jesus.

The light of religion casts a deep shadow. The orthodox Christian insists on his being a “miserable sinner;” and though some Unitarians have been somewhat reserved as to their personal confessions, they have candidly acknowledged the sins of their sect. We must not complain if others are as censorious as ourselves; but these censures may not always be just. Dr. Huntington seems to think his views necessary for religious life, and may easily draw a picture far from flattering of those with less devotional fervour. There are some whose religion is chiefly mental and moral, and who think most clearly when they banish their emotions; others run to the religion of feeling, and they feel most strongly when they banish reasoning. We believe that true religion combines the warmest affections, the intensest feelings, with the highest exercise of that understanding which is given us by the inspiration of the Almighty. Whatever may be the faults of the Unitarians of New England, they show the

works of their faith in their efforts, not merely to preserve morality and to diffuse light, but to seek and to save the lost; and we too can point to those who found the need of no mystical theology to inspire them on their mission to the outcasts and perishing.

We feel no inducement to exchange the Christian faith of Dr. Tuckerman, Dr. Channing, the Wares, and of many the savour of whose names is sweet, and whose spiritual presence is a pure blessing to us, for that which Prof. Huntington desires to recommend; but his book is worth reading, and suggests questions which ought not lightly to be dismissed; and if it is lawful to learn from an enemy, much more would we derive instruction and benefit from so earnest and eloquent a friend.

R. L. C.

---

#### THE SYNOD OF DORT.

THE history of ecclesiastical councils has a more than common interest, though of a melancholy kind, to the lover of freedom; whilst it proves at the same time most instructive, as revealing some of the springs of human actions; and it shews also conclusively the utter futility of all attempts by a dominant party to impose its peculiar form of belief on the world. The Synod of Dort, the only Protestant convocation of any note and held on a large scale,—the last, it is believed, of the kind ever likely to be held,—was in its proceedings and results no exception to remarks applicable to all assemblies convened for the settlement of theological differences. It is conceived that a brief narrative of the doings of this memorable council will not at the present time prove useless or unacceptable, though its doings are as a beacon to warn rather than a lamp to guide. Not in vain will the story be related, if from it are gathered lessons of moderation and forbearance towards those who may differ from us in points of doctrine, and all practically learn that “charity is the end of the commandment, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.”

Dort, or, as it is frequently written, Dordrecht, is an old and still considerable town of Holland, and was at the period of our narrative the metropolis of the southern division of that country. It is worthy of observation that two synods have been held here, and for the same ostensible purposes. The first, however, of little note, in 1574, when the Protestants were but just beginning to put their house in order, after the severe persecutions they had suffered from the Catholics, and the sanguinary struggles in which they had consequently been engaged. The second of these councils, which bears the name of the National Synod



and is generally known as the Synod of Dort, is the one so universally celebrated, and is the subject of this article. It was held 1618-19, and its sittings extended over several months.

In order to understand the reasons for convening this assembly, it is requisite to take a cursory view of the religious state of Europe, and more especially of Holland, at this period. The sixteenth century was the well-known era of the Reformation, and that great event, or rather series of events, had roused the energies of all Christendom, so that in every part of it there were to be found men pious, learned and zealous, who were actively employed in attacking the doctrines and the discipline of Catholicism, and in diffusing what they deemed to be purer views of gospel truth and requirements. The Roman Catholics, impatient of opposition and greatly irritated by the coarse reproaches in many instances plentifully bestowed on them by their adversaries, and believing also that heresy must be extirpated at any cost, wherever, as in several countries they still did, they possessed the power of the temporal sword, did not hesitate to employ it, and hence coercion of the most painful kind was constantly and freely used by them on the persons of the Protestants; and where the objects of their detestation contrived to elude their vengeance, names the most odious were showered on them, and crimes the most revolting not seldom laid to their charge. It is not meant that all the Papal advocates resorted to the use of these unhallowed weapons. Some there were who, in the midst of greatly exasperated feelings, protested against the employment of outward force; but these were comparatively few in number. Persecution was the besetting sin of the age, and whilst no party was entirely free from its stain, that which enjoyed the largest share of power would as a matter of course make of it the greatest and worse use. Holland, then generally with Belgium known as the Netherlands or the Low Countries, consisted of several provinces, and formed part of the hereditary dominions of Philip the Second of Spain. He was a bitter enemy to the Protestant cause and a furious persecutor. He introduced the Inquisition into Holland, and many were the victims of that inexorable tribunal. He was too faithfully seconded in all his measures of cruelty by his viceroy over the country, the Duke of Alva. The result is well known. The Hollanders rose in determined opposition to Philip's authority. Under the conduct of William, Prince of Orange, they expelled the Spaniards and declared themselves free, establishing for themselves a republican form of government, of which William was elected the Stadtholder, or head of the state. The Protestant religion under its Calvinistic form was declared the national faith; but nonconformity, though not legally recognized, was tacitly permitted. The Government was more enlightened than the Church, and averse to persecuting measures; whilst many of

the magistrates and leading men were secretly inclined to the doctrines of Arminianism.

Thus Holland, like Geneva, was the outward seat of Calvinism in its highest as well as most genuine form; whilst the popular mind had in both places gradually outstepped the limits attempted to be placed around it. The tremendous dogmas of election and reprobation were discarded for more just and cheering views of the dealings of God with men, and of the great scheme of gospel salvation. Arminius, a man of great liberality of mind, of uncommon learning, much dialectic skill, and mighty in the Scriptures, led the way in this second reformation, and his opinions were adopted by numbers of his contemporaries. He experienced much opposition and obloquy from the clergy, and all this he was well prepared to expect. Persecution in a more active form he did not experience, the magistracy upholding him. He died 1609, before the troubles of his country came on. The very next year, however, his followers, who formed a numerous body, were compelled to present to the Government a remonstrance against the many false accusations that were industriously circulated to their disadvantage. They had been charged with heresy and schism in religious matters, and with disaffection to the State. In a very able manner they gave a summary of their belief, defending their positions skilfully, and evincing throughout profound scriptural knowledge. From this circumstance they were named Remonstrants, and under the designation are known to the readers of history. The magistrates had little desire to become partizans in the dispute; they exhorted both sides to union, and that on neither should sermons be preached on controverted topics,—advice which was palatable to none, and which was never cordially acted on by any. The spirits of the Remonstrants, as they now began to be called, were at this time greatly raised by one of their leaders, the celebrated Episcopius, being, though with considerable opposition, inducted as pastor of a church near to Rotterdam.

But a storm was gathering over the heads of the Remonstrants, which ere long burst furiously and involved the body in ruin. Maurice, the son of William, Prince of Orange, and who on the death of his father had succeeded to the Stadtholdership, was a man of great ambition, and aimed at the possession of sovereign power. The Remonstrants, who had in common with others sworn allegiance to the existing Government, and were satisfied with the connivance, precarious as it was, which protected them in the exercise of their rights as citizens, strenuously opposed his projects; whilst it is charged on the opposite party that his views found favour among its adherents. Maurice, therefore, from political motives, espoused the Calvinistic cause; and as Calvinism was established by law, he had all the *prestige* of the State religion in his favour. By an arbitrary stretch of power, he



changed a great part of the magistracy, and nominated to the vacancies thus created men entirely devoted to his purpose. By his influence over the States-General, an ordinance was issued by that body for the convocation of a Synod which should have power to consider and settle all disputed points both of doctrine and discipline, and thus present to the world a perfect system of theology, a model ecclesiastical platform, from which all might take pattern, and, as it was fondly but vainly imagined, entire uniformity of faith and practice be secured. This ordinance of the Government was readily and gladly obeyed by the Calvinists, whilst it was sanctioned by the approval of nearly all the Protestant states of Europe, who sent their deputies to the Synod in compliance with a pressing invitation thus to fraternize. The French Protestants had obtained leave from their sovereign, Louis the Thirteenth, to send two delegates; but before the Synod was convened, the King, acting as it was supposed under the influence of the Jesuits by whom he was surrounded, revoked his permission, and consequently the Reformed Church of France was unrepresented. Several of the most able theologians from Germany, the Palatinate and Switzerland, were nominated by their respective Governments to be present; and from Great Britain a few men of the highest reputation in the English and Scotch Churches were selected by the King himself thus to uphold and strengthen the hands of their continental brethren. James the First, it is supposed, had a leaning towards the opinions of the Remonstrants, as it was in his reign that Arminianism made its appearance in the Church of England, and was embraced by many of the higher clergy; but the crooked system of policy pursued by this the meanest of our sovereigns, and which he strove to dignify by the name of kingcraft, led him in this instance to take part with the Calvinistic section, and hence the English deputies too frequently concurred in acts of the Synod which in their hearts they must have disapproved.

The elections in Holland had been very artfully managed so as to secure an overwhelming majority in the Synod to the dominant party. Out of the whole body of Remonstrants, two ministers only, with one of the elders, were chosen. A seat in the council was claimed for Episcopius, as his colleague in the pastorship, a Calvinist, had been elected; but the motion was overruled. The whole proceedings against the Arminians were unfair and iniquitous. These unfortunate dissidents found themselves prejudged, and that their condemnation was already determined on. It has been said, in justification of their opponents, that men could hardly have come to the Synod without having previously made up their minds on the important matters then at issue; but this is quite beside the question. The Synod was national, and of the essence of a deliberative assembly. All parties had an equal right to be represented in it, and, by their

freely-chosen delegates, to express their opinions and to record their votes. But the plainest principles of equity were disregarded, in order to ensure the downfall of men who had dared to think and act for themselves.

Among those who were present at the deliberations of the Synod, which were generally open to the public, including ladies, as a spectator, though by no means an unconcerned one, was a man of the rarest capacity and of acquirements the most extraordinary—John Hales, to whose name, as if by common consent, the epithet of “the ever-memorable” is almost invariably attached. Hales was now in Holland as chaplain to the British embassy, and in that capacity had ready admission to all the proceedings; whilst, it is supposed, he had secret instructions from King James to watch and report them. Of these he has given some graphic and very amusing accounts, and his fidelity is unimpeachable. Hales was evidently on the side of the Remonstrants, and must have deeply sympathized with them in the hard treatment they suffered. He does not in his narrative spare their adversaries, and they assuredly laid themselves open to the severest censures of all who, like Hales, valued rational liberty of investigation, especially in religious matters, above all earthly good.

The Synod of Dort met in November, 1618. On the 5th of the month, a memorable day, as the English delegates must have regarded it, the ambassador from Britain introduced his countrymen, in a recommendatory address, to the presence of their High Mightinesses the members of the States-General. Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff, and one of the deputies, made a suitable reply. They were received with every mark of distinction. A few days after, the Swiss delegates were honoured with a similar audience. It was on the 13th that the Synod first met in conclave. That so remarkable an epoch might not be without its portent, a comet was observed from the end of the month till the middle of the following January. Muller, a professor of Groningen, was greatly alarmed at its appearance, and published a mystical book on the subject. Gassendi, the great astronomer, made himself merry with the fears of those who, like Muller, attempted to know the times and the seasons by means never put in man's power.

Preliminary to entering on the proper business of the Synod, two sermons were preached to the Dutch members in the morning and afternoon of the first day, the one in their own language, the other in French. With much ceremony, the foreign deputies that had then arrived were introduced to their colleagues, and, with them, commissioners nominated by the Government to watch and, when necessary, interpose a check on the proceedings. These venerable personages took the right-hand place of honour “near the chimney,” a truly Dutch mode of asserting their dignity. The English clergy were seated opposite to them, and a place



was reserved for the French deputies, but whom their bigoted King prevented from appearing. The other members were variously accommodated. About ninety persons were present, of whom twenty-eight were foreigners, the Dutch provinces sending a greater number of representatives than the States had commanded. This was but the beginning of the irregularities and the gross partiality that governed the whole course of procedure. Of the men composing this remarkable council, the names of a few have worthily descended to posterity. Hall and Davenant, of the English Church,—Altingius, Cocchius, Diodati, Polyander and Gomarius, of the Calvinistic and Lutheran,—whilst cited to their bar, treated at first with some show of respect, but afterwards with shameful insult, were men high as the highest of these in intellect and acquirements, and yielding to none of them in uprightness of intention and purity of life and conversation. It deserves to be mentioned that the place of the Synod's assembly yet exists—a large, ancient inn in one of the principal streets of Dort; but the spacious room in which the sittings were held has been sadly desecrated by being converted into a music saloon, the tawdry ornaments of which ill accord with feelings that must arise in the mind at the recalling of the scenes to which its walls have borne witness.

The members of the Synod having been duly arranged, a prayer in Latin was offered up by Lydius. It had been properly decided that the public proceedings should be in that language, as the best medium of communication between learned foreigners. Lydius, at the conclusion, paid the compliments of the Dutch members to the commissioners and to the foreign delegates present. The chief commissioner replied for his colleagues and himself. Heinsius was nominated secretary to the commission, on account, as it was alleged, of his eminent literary abilities and the elegance of his Latinity; as a theologian, however, his reputation was very slight. The choice was displeasing to the Remonstrants, as they knew him to be their enemy. For a similar reason they objected to the commissioners, men also of "little Latin and less Greek," and whose knowledge of theology scarcely went beyond its rudiments. The Synod elected as moderator John Bogerman, and with him two assessors. Two secretaries were also chosen for the assembly. These five persons were avowed opponents to the Remonstrants, the moderator having adopted Beza's maxim, that it was lawful to put heretics to death. The Dutch members of the Synod were alone concerned in these elections, the foreign divines having refused to take any part in them. From this fact alone, the Remonstrants were justified in believing that their ruin was sealed.

Day by day did these men of the Synod, whose zeal was greater than their knowledge and far exceeded their charity, meet for action, till dead winter overtook their deliberations, and then

gave place to the early spring, and that again to the first blush of summer. The conferences were not finished till the expiration of May, and even then there were some who cast longing, lingering looks behind them. And yet, with the exception of the condemnation of the Remonstrants, there seems to be little worthy of note in the proceedings, unless it be that a proposal was made and carried into execution for a translation of the Bible into Dutch. Three persons for the Old Testament and the like number for the New were named to this important work, and a committee appointed to revise their labours. The rules established by the Royal authority for the guidance of the English translators of the Scriptures were mentioned, but the Dutch little regarded them; and yet, under the existing circumstances and on the whole, these rules were among the best that could have been adopted to ensure success, and the observance of them was sufficient to produce what is by no means a faultless version and which has suffered something from the lapse of time, and yet is of such majestic simplicity, and has entered so deeply into the religious heart of England, that no other translation, however literally faithful it may be, will be received by the people unless it be based on this, and its genuine Saxon character departed from in the least possible way. As regards some other matters which occupied the Synod's time and attention, Hales has given, in his usual lively and somewhat satirical manner, an account. He has remarked on the noisy disputes and sharp contentions continually taking place on the merest trifles, and, as an instance, mentions that much time was wasted, and many needless words bestowed, on the question whether in prayer the singular or plural pronoun should be applied to the object of it. *Thou* seems at first to have had the preference, but eventually the votes were determined for *you*. Hales subsequently likened the Synod in its course of action to a clock, of which the main springs of motion are concealed from view.

Our attention must now be turned to the Remonstrants, whose doctrines, widely spread and in many instances eagerly received, were the terror as well as aversion of the orthodox party. The deputies from Geneva, true to the characteristic principles of their churches and of the stern reformer who laid their foundation and so long bore rule over them, in presenting their credentials to the Synod, spoke bitterly against the Arminians and other heretics, and their objurgations seem to have given a tone to many of the subsequent proceedings. The Remonstrant ministers having been summoned to appear, several of them entered the assembly, headed by Episcopius. He was in himself a host, and by his eloquence made a considerable impression even on that bigoted and prejudiced conclave. On one occasion he spoke for an hour and a half, and moved some of his audience to tears. From the first the Remonstrants had protested against the autho-



urity of the Synod to judge them, and this plea they never retracted. Episcopius requested that a paper prepared by the accused ministers might be received. This was acceded to, and it was publicly read. The document was ably set forth, but great liberties were taken by the writers with the constitution of synods, and it was roundly asserted that a free assembly of the kind never had existed and never would exist. It gave much offence, as might have been expected; and the presentation of it was an imprudent step on the part of the memorialists, as the tendency inevitably was to make still wider the breach between the parties. Repeatedly were the Remonstrants called before the council to endure browbeatings and reproach. The secretary, Heinsius, during the confusion that on one of these occasions prevailed, lost all command of temper, and when the question was put to the defendants whether they would submit to the Synod's decision, violently struck the table with his fist, exclaiming in a loud and angry tone, "Will you obey or not?"—whilst the moderator—what a satire is this designation on many a one who has officially borne it!—the moderator acted with the grossest partiality, and committed the most flagrant breaches of decorum and of good manners throughout the sittings. "Hold your tongue!" was his peremptory injunction to Episcopius when he complained of the injustice of the Synod to himself and his friends. Niellius, another Remonstrant, solemnly appealed from the assembly to the throne of Jesus Christ. The defendants were soon after forcibly expelled from the council, though ordered by the commissioners not to leave the town without express permission. Their ejection did not, however, meet the approval of the foreign delegates, who exclaimed warmly against the irregularity as well as manifest injustice of the proceedings; but their protest was made in vain. At nearly the close of the protracted session, the members of the Synod went in great state to the great church, and there, in the presence of a vast multitude of persons of every degree, and after a long Latin prayer by the moderator, the canons of the Synod were read by the two secretaries alternately, and then the condemnation of the Remonstrants. The commissioners, however, would do no more than certify to the correctness of the minutes, and refused formally to sanction either the canons or the condemnation.

In the evening, the Remonstrant ministers were officially informed by the commissioners of the sentence of deprivation pronounced against them. "Is this all, my lords?" replied the intrepid Episcopius. "Well, we bless God and our Saviour Jesus Christ that he has counted us worthy to suffer this reproach for his sake." The Government, still at the instigation of the Stadtholder, Maurice, sent these great and good men into exile, where many of them ended their days in great poverty. Episcopius himself went to Antwerp; but on the death of his power-

ful enemy, Maurice, he returned to Holland and settled for some time at Rotterdam. He removed subsequently to Amsterdam, where he died at the age of fifty-one.

The eloquent Joseph Hall, who was at the time Dean of Worcester, and afterwards successively Bishop of Exeter and of Norwich, was, as has been mentioned, one of the delegates to the Synod. He had preached before the assembly at an early period of the sittings, and his exhortations were directed to peace and unity. He plainly told his hearers that the names of Calvinist and Arminian should be merged and lost in the name of Christian. Hall left Dort in the middle of January on the plea of indisposition, and did not return. He was evidently disgusted at the narrow and intolerant spirit manifested. Balcanqual, his colleague from Scotland, but who remained till the termination of the sittings, spoke to the British ambassadors in terms of strong indignation on the artful and unworthy conduct of the moderator. Others of the members acknowledged the wrong done to the Remonstrants; and Martinus, one of the Dutch ministers and a delegate, remarked that he could say, with Gregory of Nazianzen, he had never known councils end happily: they had ever served only to increase the evils complained of. He declared his resolution never to attend another Synod, and passionately deplored his having seen Dort. The evil effects of the Synod did not terminate with the condemnation of the Arminians and the exile of their ministers. Prince Maurice carried on a violent persecution on political grounds. The grey hairs of the virtuous Barneveldt could not save him from the scaffold. This venerable magistrate was, on a false charge of treason, beheaded at the advanced age of seventy-two; whilst the surpassing learning and abilities of Grotius were insufficient to shield him from a sentence of perpetual imprisonment on the same futile accusation. After two years' confinement, through the affectionate stratagem of his wife, Grotius fortunately escaped to France, and at length ended his days, full of honour, in Sweden.

Another illustrious sufferer for conscience' sake and from the proceedings of the Synod, was the accomplished and excellent Vorstius, against whom, more than even Episcopius, the persevering malignity of the dominant party was directed. Vorstius had also the singular honour of incurring the vindictive enmity of our James the First. This contemptible pedant—of whom it has been well remarked that, by a cruel insult to the memory of the wise king of Israel, he is styled the British Solomon—was professedly much shocked by some parts of a work written by Vorstius, and, in condescending to reply to the arguments it contained, he pointed out certain propositions advanced by Vorstius to the notice of the rulers of Holland, accompanied by an intimation that they would do well to take cognizance of both book and author—consign the former to the flames, whilst a similar

fate would hardly be too severe for the latter. The magistrates temporized, protected Vorstius as long as was safe for themselves, and then permitted his escape from their jurisdiction; but they were compelled to deprive him of his professorship, the emoluments of which constituted his principal source of income. Socinianism was charged on him; and this ugly term of reproach was sufficient, if it could be fastened on a man's principles, to blacken his reputation and ensure his worldly ruin. Scott, it is well known, has sketched the character of James most felicitously in his *Fortunes of Nigel*, and every one has read the scene between the hero of the tale and the blustering, imbecile King, in which the name of Vorstius is introduced. The monarch is eager to know, from one just arrived out of the Low Countries, how his enemy fares under neglect and contempt. The reply of the young Lord Glenvarloch is worthy of a courtier of the age, though but of "five minutes' standing:" Vorstius yet lived, but was lying helpless, prostrated by the thunders of the Royal eloquence! This admirable man died at Toningén, in Denmark, 1622.

The Synod had now finished the business for which it had been convened. Nothing remained to be done save to wind up the proceedings by compliments and ceremony. The foreign delegates left Dort immediately after the condemnation of the Remonstrants. They were warmly thanked by the commissioners for their services, and were dismissed by the moderator with a recommendation to the protection of God and the holy angels, and a fervently-expressed hope that all might meet in a new and everlasting synod in heaven. A splendid dinner, accompanied by a concert, in which the female performers were concealed from view, was given; but to the discredit of some who partook of the entertainment, Dutch hospitality threw them off their guard, and in their conviviality they exceeded the bounds of temperance. The whole expenses of the Synod, it is said, amounted to the enormous sum of a million of florins—between eighty and ninety thousand pounds; but this is probably an exaggerated statement. The foreigners had all their expenses borne, and on a liberal scale; and to each of them, on departure, a gold medal and chain was presented, worth two hundred florins. The medal had suitable devices and mottos commemorative of the great event which had called so many grave and learned men together.

The delegates from Holland remained for a short time after their colleagues had taken leave, to settle points of peculiar interest to themselves; but on the 29th of May, a final termination was put to the convocation. The whole of the members that were left went on that day in regular order to the largest church of the town, where Lydius, who had opened the Synod, now preached to an overflowing congregation. His discourse, which was mainly directed against the Remonstrants and their heretical



tenets, was by no means remarkable either for ability or candour. Returning to the ancient inn and the chamber of council, the deputies were thanked by the commissioners in the name of the States for their zealous labours, and, after prayer by the moderator and mutual shaking of hands, the Synod was in proper form dissolved, the late members dispersing to their several homes. The moderator, with his assessors and the secretaries, were well paid for their services, and the commissioners had a large sum awarded to them. The Dutch members had silver medals presented to them; they had besides a daily allowance of four florins to each person for subsistence. It is but fair to mention that the fifteen Remonstrant ministers who had been cited before the Synod had each the like sum given to him for the same purpose. And such was the end of the far-famed Synod of Dort—its acts to the full as mischievous and useless as those which have characterized all other ecclesiastical convocations; but though the results were very evil for the time, yet they did not continue long. Arminianism rebounded, Antæus-like, from its rude fall to the earth, from which it seemed to gather fresh vigour. The doctrines of Calvin lost their hold on men's minds; and both Holland and Switzerland, Amsterdam and Geneva, became at length renowned as asylums for persecuted opinion, where liberty of thought was unchecked and free investigation encouraged, and where candour and charity in blessed union shed a healing influence on the surrounding nations.

T. B. N.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### DR. CHANNING'S LATEST RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

SIR,

I WAS glad to see in the last number of the *Christian Reformer* the letter of "An Old Subscriber," and your own observations, on the subject of Dr. Channing's latest religious opinions. It is difficult to understand how any one, with the slightest regard to veracity, after a careful perusal of the beautiful Memoir of this great and good man by his nephew, can pretend that there is any ground whatever for the rumour that Dr. Channing, in his last illness, embraced the so-called *orthodox* faith. But there can be no doubt that the "calumny" is constantly reiterated, and that it is very generally reported in this country, amongst a certain class of religionists, that Dr. Channing, in the closing hours of life, feeling the insufficiency of Unitarianism to give him support and consolation, renounced the form of Christianity which during his active ministry he had so eloquently preached and so powerfully defended. Amongst those who have aided in giving extensive currency to this misstatement, the Rev. Dr. Cumming holds a prominent position. In his *Lectures on Daniel*, after referring to some remarks in the writ-

ings of Channing on the death of Christ, which he certainly does not comprehend,—this popular divine goes on to observe, that there is reason to think that what has been *said* of Channing is *true*, and that he died “renouncing the Socinianism which cannot save,” “and accepting the precious blood of Jesus as that which cleanseth from all sin.”

My attention was directed to this passage,—which was printed in one of our papers during the excitement which arose in this city, on account of the denial of the Christian name to Unitarians by the Rev. Hugh Stowell on the platform of the Bible Society,—and I at once addressed a private communication to Dr. Cumming, and a letter to the Editor of the Bristol Times. My impression was, that Dr. Cumming had never seen the Memoir of Dr. Channing, and that he was consequently ignorant of the positive denial which had been given to the assertion that on his death-bed Channing changed his sentiments. To my surprise and sorrow, however, I found that Dr. Cumming wrote with a full knowledge of the statement of Channing’s biographer, and that he was prepared to set up his own rash inferences and false conclusions against the emphatic declaration of one who knew more of Dr. Channing’s religious views and inner life than any other person, in order, vainly, to justify what he had done.

When Mr. Channing visited us last year, I mentioned to him the circumstances which had led to this correspondence, and its result, and he then authorized me to say, that the truths and hopes of the gospel, as interpreted by Unitarian believers, which Dr. Channing embraced when his great powers were in full vigour, were his comfort and joy to the last, and that under their blessed influence he calmly departed to his heavenly rest and reward.

It has occurred to me that the letters which I send with this, and which were published only in this neighbourhood, may not unsuitably at this time find a place in your pages. If you agree with me, your readers will at least have an opportunity of knowing something of the reckless manner in which Dr. Cumming deals with the most solemn statements, when they are opposed to his own “logic.” They will also, perhaps, be led to feel more strongly how urgent is still the call upon Unitarians to employ their most zealous exertions for the removal of the obstacles to the diffusion of what they hold to be pure Christianity, which arise from the teachings and publications of those who *will* unscrupulously misrepresent it. Let me add, in conclusion, that I have never received the pamphlet which, it will be seen, was promised by Dr. Cumming, and that, whatever he may have to say on the question, “Is Socinianism Christianity?” it is my earnest conviction that Unitarianism is the doctrine of the gospel.

Bristol, Sept. 16, 1856.

WILLIAM JAMES.

DR. CHANNING AND DR. CUMMING.

*To the Editor of the Bristol Times and Felix Farley’s Journal.*

Sir,—In the last number of your paper, there is an extract from Dr. Cumming’s Lectures on the Book of Daniel, in which he states that he is induced to believe, from a passage to which he refers in Dr. Channing’s writings on the death of Christ, but which he evidently misunderstands, that the great American Unitarian divine was *truly* reported to have renounced the faith of which he had been so distinguished an advocate. Now, Sir, even if our religious principles were deprived of the advantage arising from the perfect peace and

joyful hope with which Channing closed his earthly life, it would in no degree affect the truth of the Unitarian view of Christianity. The question is, not whether Unitarianism is built upon the conclusions of *Channing*—lofty as was his mind and saintly his character—but does it rest on the good and solid foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone? And this question is not one to be argued in the pages of a newspaper. We are happily, however, in a situation to prove that the doctrine which Channing embraced in the maturity of his powers, and preached with an eloquence rarely equalled in the vigour of his days, afforded him abundant consolation and support in the immediate prospect of dissolution. One who was privileged to be with him in his last hours, and to see him die, has described the solemn yet beautiful scene, when, “amidst the glory of autumn, on the day consecrated to the memory of the risen Christ,”—the sun having just set, and the clouds and sky bright “with gold and crimson, he turned towards the windows, and looking eastward, as if in the setting sun’s reflected light, he saw promises of a brighter morning,”—his spirit passed, and “he was taken home.” His biographer, in a note appended to the *Memoir of Channing*,\* observes,—“I feel as if it were insulting the memory of my uncle to refer even to the assertion, that on his death-bed he changed his opinions. But the urgency of many correspondents induces me here to say, once for all, that there was *no foundation* whatever for such a rumour. This distinct statement should for ever put an end to the calumny referred to, among all honest men.” And yet it is still reiterated in books and journals called religious! I cannot of course suppose that Dr. Cumming has read the *Life of Channing*. But, then, is it right or just, I would ask, for a man in his position to write or speak of another as he has done of Channing, without taking the trouble to ascertain the truth? If this should meet his eye, I hope he will lose no time in *cancelling the page* on which he has done so great a wrong to the name and memory and cherished convictions of one who, more perhaps than any preacher or writer of the present age, has advanced the cause of pure religion amongst persons of thought and culture, both in this country and in his own land. If Dr. Cumming is not more cautious as an interpreter of the Bible than he has been in his representation concerning “the dying creed” of Channing, he must be a very unsafe guide, and his teaching in relation to the visions and prophecies of Daniel, will rather mislead than instruct and benefit his numerous readers.

I very much regret, Sir, that I should have had to address you on this subject. Your ably-conducted journal is read by persons of different denominations, and I should be sorry to see it devoted to the discussion of disputed points of theology. My only object in writing now is to correct the error into which Dr. Cumming has fallen respecting Channing, and to which, without being aware of the real state of the case, you have been the means of giving an extensive circulation.

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Bristol, January 24th, 1854.

WILLIAM JAMES.

---

Sir,—I have received three numbers of your paper, containing a letter from a correspondent who signs his letter “W. James.” I have also received a letter from the same gentleman, whom I have not the advantage of knowing, complaining of a passage in my *Lectures on Daniel* respecting Dr. Channing. Mr. James does not hesitate to assert that “if Dr. Cumming is not more cautious as an interpreter of the Bible than he has been in his representation concerning the dying creed of Dr. Channing, he must be a very unsafe guide.”

The only passage I can discover in my book, which you may have done me the honour to quote, occurs at page 365,—“Dr. Channing, whose dying creed, *it is said*, was very different from his living creed, renouncing the Socinianism which could not save, and accepting Christianity, which alone proclaims the



atonement and the forgiveness of sins, states, 'Many of us are dissatisfied with the explanation of the death of Christ (that it procures forgiveness, by leading to that repentance and virtue which is the great and only condition on which repentance is bestowed), and think that the Scriptures ascribe the remission of sins to Christ's death, with an emphasis so peculiar, that we ought to consider this event as having a special influence in removing punishment.' Here is a ray of light entering into that great man's mind, shewing how dissatisfied he was with the popular theology of his body, and thus inducing us to believe that *what is reported* of him is true—that he died renouncing his Unitarianism, and accepting the precious blood of Jesus as that which cleanseth from all sin." Lectures on Daniel, p. 365.

Now, so far from taking the advice of your correspondent, Mr. James, and cancelling this page, I mean to do the very reverse, by strengthening it in the next edition.

Any person will see just two assertions: first, that a rumour exists that Dr. Channing gave up his Unitarianism in his last illness. This rumour is not denied. Secondly, an *inference*, from a statement of Dr. Channing, that this rumour was true. This logic is not impugned. I do not speak as a *witness*, but as a reasoner. I do not depose to the truth or falsity of the rumour from personal knowledge, but I draw from Channing's words an *inference* which readers less blinded by Socinian zeal than your correspondent would logically draw also.

Mr. James makes quite sure that I have never read the Life of Channing. Judging from his quotation, he seems to have cast his eye on the editor's note at the end of the book, but to be utterly innocent of having read the book. Your readers will infer who has and who has not read the work. In my edition of his Life, published by Routledge, 1850, and at p. 105 of Vol. II., I find express declarations of Dr. Channing that will require great ingenuity in Mr. James to explain. Dr. Channing says, "I HAVE LITTLE OR NO INTEREST IN UNITARIANS AS A SECT. WITH DR. PRIESTLEY, WHO HAD MOST TO DO IN PRODUCING THE LATE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT, I HAVE LESS SYMPATHY THAN WITH MANY OF THE ORTHODOX." Page 106, "I AM LITTLE OF A UNITARIAN, I HAVE LITTLE SYMPATHY WITH THE SYSTEM OF PRIESTLEY AND BELSHAM."

I admit his nephew tries to neutralize these words. Mr. James will, in all probability, do the same.

Dr. Channing, I also admit, long and ably, but most inconclusively, preached Unitarianism. Of this there is plenty and painful evidence. But the words I have quoted were among his LAST, and if Mr. James be a Socinian layman or minister, I pray that he too may live to renounce Socinianism, the half-way house to Infidelity, and accept from the heart a refuge in the Rock of Ages, Christ Jesus, who is God over all.

Having thus not only justified all I have written about Dr. Channing, but strengthened my position, I close a dispute which is concerned only about a biographical fact, and hope by and bye to issue from the press a very short pamphlet, entitled, "Is Socinianism Christianity?" which I will do myself the pleasure of transmitting to Mr. James.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN CUMMING.

7, Montagu Place, Russell Square, London, Feb. 13th.

---

Sir,—I could not deny the existence of a "rumour" that Dr. Channing had changed his opinions in his last illness. But the truth of that rumour I *did* deny, on authority which it appears to me ought not to be questioned. His nephew and biographer, upon the evidence of constant intercourse and of the closest observation, pronounces it a CALUMNY, and says that "this distinct statement should for ever put an end to it amongst all honest men." Dr. Cumming, however, persists in inferring that the dying creed of Channing *was* different from his living faith—first, on the ground previously taken in

regard to his views of Christ's death, and secondly, from certain passages quoted in your last week's paper, which are thought by Dr. Cumming to justify and strengthen his position. Let us see.

The "logic" of Dr. Cumming would seem to consist in this—Dr. Channing held certain modified views on the special influence of the death of Christ; *therefore*, the "rumour" is true that he renounced his Unitarianism. The connection of the premiss with the conclusion is not very apparent. Had Dr. Cumming ever heard of such writers as Dr. Samuel Clarke or Dr. Richard Price? If he had, a severer "logic" would have led him to conclude that similar views in relation to Christ's *death*, with those of Channing, may be held by Unitarians, and by some of the most elaborate defenders of Unitarian doctrine concerning Christ's *person*.

But now to the passages so prominently brought forward in your last journal.

Dr. Channing avowed that he had "little or no interest in Unitarians, *as a sect*," and that he was "little of an Unitarian." And these, we are reminded, were amongst his *last* words. They were written more than a year before his death. But they contain the same sentiment which he had long before expressed in his sermons. "I belong," said he, "to that class of Christians who are distinguished by believing that there is one God, even the Father, and that Jesus Christ is not this one God, but his dependant and obedient Son. . . . But I have no anxiety to wear the livery of any party. I indeed take cheerfully the name of a Unitarian, because unwearied efforts are used to raise against it a popular cry, and I have not so learned Christ as to shrink from reproaches cast on what I deem is truth. Were the name more honoured, I should be glad to throw it off. I desire to escape the narrow walls of a particular church, and to stand under the open sky, in the broad light, looking far and wide, seeing with my own eyes, hearing with my own ears, and following Truth meekly but resolutely, however arduous or solitary the path in which she leads."\*

No "great ingenuity," then, on my part, is required to explain what was intended by Channing, when he said, "I am little of a Unitarian." Agreeing in the great principles with which this name is associated, he feared party shackles, and wished to be regarded as belonging "to the community of free minds, of lovers of truth, of followers of Christ, both on earth and in heaven." Sectarian leaders, and men who never soar above the littleness of a polemical temper, may not be able to understand these enlarged views and sympathies; but they were dear to Channing in the vigour of his ministry, and not less cherished as he approached the better country, where the noise of contention and the voice of controversy are heard no more.

But he also declared that he had "little sympathy with the system of Priestley and Belsham." What he meant is obvious enough to those who have read his writings, or even the Memoir,† with candour. He was persuaded, and there are many who agree with him in opinion, that the doctrines of Philosophical Necessity, Materialism and Humanitarianism, as advocated by Priestley, and embraced by numbers of Unitarians in England, have been a great hindrance to the spread of Unitarian Christianity. These speculations have, however, no necessary connection with "the belief in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, as alone and exclusively the supreme and independent God"—Channing's own definition of what constitutes a Unitarian. There can be no doubt that the spiritual tendencies of his mind were *always* opposed to "the system of Priestley" on the points to which I have adverted; and as far as they were identified with it, his agreement with that "good and great man," as he justly calls him, was "less than with the orthodox." But what proof does this afford of his having "died renouncing Unitarianism"? At a later

\* Works, Vol. III. p. 210.

† Memoir (Chapman's edition), Vol. II. pp. 424, 444.

period than that to which Dr. Cumming's quotations refer, he may find words from Channing which expressed his sense of the value of the Unitarian doctrine, and its "freedom from the many great and pernicious errors of older systems."\* Not a syllable is there in his correspondence or conversations which indicates that his hope and consolation in sickness and the approach of death were drawn from any other faith than that which he had preached. And *never*, we are informed, "*was he in his opinions more decidedly a Unitarian, than in the last year of his life and on his death-bed.*"†

Dr. Cumming's unsupported assertions as to the tendency of Unitarianism will have no power over our minds, nor will his denunciations cause us any alarm. Whether it is from heaven or of men is an inquiry which must be decided by an appeal to the law and to the testimony. When Dr. Cumming affords me the opportunity, as he courteously proposes to do, of seeing what he has to offer on this question, I shall not fail to give it my serious attention. In the mean time, I may be permitted to remind him, that Calvinism and Trinitarianism are not keeping unbelief out of England, and to observe, that a faith which in its leading doctrines has been adopted by such writers, in support and defence of Christianity, as Locke, Clarke, Lardner and Channing, will not suffer in the estimation of the wise and good by being rashly designated "the half-way house to Infidelity."

I am, Sir, yours obediently,

Bristol, Feb. 22nd, 1854.

WILLIAM JAMES.

#### THE BIBLE IN WALES A CENTURY AGO.

SIR,

In a speech recently made in Parliament, Mr. Heywood said it was stated in Disraeli's "Curiosities of Literature," that the Bible was not much in use in this country before the restoration of monarchy in 1660. Some of your readers will perhaps be interested by the following extract, from which they may judge how far that was the case in North Wales down to a considerably later time. In a letter dated 1770, Mr. Travers, of Wrexham, writes,— "There is such a want of Bibles among the poor" in those parts of Wales in which he lived, "that there is hardly one to be found in some miles." It is not irrelevant to refer, in connection with this, to another letter, dated 1738, from the Rev. Edward Kenrick, of Bronyglyder, purporting that at the town of Montgomery there was "not (except the schoolmaster) one Dissenter in or near the place." To the proper principles of "Dissent," under whatever name, belongs the honour of having subsequently carried the Bible into every cottage, and of having diffused abroad religious knowledge to a degree and extent unparalleled in the history of the world.

London, Aug: 22, 1856.

WALTER D. JEREMY.

\* Memoir, p. 410.

† Memoir, Vol. II. p. 392.



## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Free Discussion versus Intolerance; or, the Liverpool Clerical Society's Mode of expelling a Brother Clergyman who differed from them, and expressed his Difference: a Narrative.* By the Rev. John Macnaught, M.A., Oxon, Incumbent of St. Chrysostom's Church, Everton, Liverpool. Pp. 88. London—Longmans.

WE recently placed before our readers a review of Mr. Macnaught's remarkable and outspoken book on the Inspiration of the Bible, in which he emphatically and earnestly denied its infallibility. The penalty of that publication was, that he was expelled from the Liverpool Clerical Society. Protesting against that measure, and feeling himself aggrieved, he has published a detailed account of the whole proceeding, the title of which we have prefixed above. His Narrative has been variously commented upon by the Liverpool press, but we are not aware that any contradiction or correction of his statements has subsequently been issued by any of the parties to his expulsion, from which we infer that they are content that it should produce its own effect upon the public. We must candidly confess that we do not altogether like the tone and spirit of his pamphlet. He seems (and, so far as appears, without adequate grounds) to wish to fasten a stigma of ungentlemanliness on his opponents, and hints an appeal to the national prejudices of his English readers, by intimating that the whole proceeding savoured something of "an Irish row." No doubt it is difficult for us to look at the matter from his point of view. He assumes throughout an air of being amazed and indignant at his treatment. To us, on the contrary, it appears precisely what might reasonably be expected from a body of "Evangelical" clergymen, without necessarily imputing to them any party or sinister motives.

He begins with a sketch of the history of the Liverpool Clerical Society, which appears to have gradually grown from a quiet party, meeting once a month at private houses, to an association of imposing dimensions. In its original form, so far as it had a definite object, that appears to have been "the pious but uncritical study of the Bible." Mr. Macnaught was first introduced to it as curate to the late much-respected Rev. W. W. Ewbank, of St. George's, Everton.

"The old fashion was, that the senior members got up the annotation of a particular passage of Scripture from Matthew Henry, Scott, Doddridge and the commentators. Of their various recollections of these commentaries they delivered themselves one after another at the commencement of the meeting. Some took the high Calvinistic view of the evening's portion of Scripture. Some pointed the verses against Rome or Oxford or Pusey. Some looked through the verses as a medium for beholding Jewish restoration and a Judaized Millennium. In a word, the older champions of the Society—Buddicom and Tattershall and Byrth—had left it: and there was nothing to check the wild extravagancies of the Irish Millennialian party except the patient, gentlemanly, and gradually developing theology of Mr. Ewbank."—P. 6.

We fear Mr. Thackeray would characterize a "gentlemanly theology" as rather a "snobbish" expression. Our author proceeds to intimate that Mr. Ewbank's lamented death removed the great obstacle to the domination of the "Evangelical" section:

"The only man who was known to have deeply sympathized with Mr. Ewbank was Mr. Macnaught; but then he was regarded as a mere youth. He had often declared himself in favour of peace between the Millenarians and their opponents. His theological views could not yet be very definitely formed. He had had a large church built for him, and it was well filled. He thus had some strength, and there were in him some hostile elements; but it was hoped that he might easily be soothed into submission to those who had fought to the death with Mr. Ewbank, and who now seemed so near to undisputed triumph. Accordingly, fair measures were tried with Mr. Macnaught, until it was found that, though he loved peace much, he loved truth, intelligence and candour even more. When this discovery had been made, and when, moreover, it was seen that this youthful incumbent of St. Chrysostom's was studying the new theology as well as the old, and that he was kindling the thoughts of other young men by the free though courteous avowal of every well-ascertained result of his studies and of his thoughts, then the leaders of the Millenarian party saw that they must change their tactics. They must put down this intruder from Everton, or they might have their supremacy questioned, their yoke thrown off, and a free study of God's word, resulting in Christian liberty and joy, might supplant the compound of Calvinism and Judaism which they called 'the Gospel.'—Pp. 6, 7.

This, though a little grandiloquent and self-glorifying, may be true for aught we know; but it is scarcely sustained, we think, by the facts adduced in these pages. Mr. Macnaught then appends the Rules of the Society as adopted in December, 1855, from which it appears that all clergymen resident for six months within the archdeaconry of Liverpool are eligible as members; that the election of members and of officers is to be by ballot; and that certain meetings are to be appropriated to the discussion of theological subjects. Then is given at length (rather needlessly, we think) the hymn (*Veni Creator Spiritus*) and the form of prayer from the Litany, with which every meeting (after tea) commences. Then follows a list of the members, 77 in number, and of the officers for the present year, the Ven. Archdeacon Jones, President, and the Rev. Dr. McNeile one of the Vice-Presidents. Mr. Macnaught lays repeated stress on the fact that the Rules make no provision for the expulsion of any of the members. We confess that this circumstance does not appear to us to be of much weight. A voluntary association is surely not to be precluded from expelling an obnoxious member merely because it does not happen to have anticipated and provided for the emergency by a specific Rule.

In Chapter ii., Mr. Macnaught relates the proceedings of a meeting of the Society on September 4, 1854, at which the subject of discussion was, the Discrepancies between the Statement of Stephen in Acts vii. 1—16, and the Statement in Genesis. Mr. Macnaught asked how they could be explained away. The Rev. S. Minton denied the inspiration of Stephen, which Mr. Macnaught asserted. At a meeting in the following December at the house of Dr. McNeile, the subject of Inspiration was discussed generally, and Mr. Macnaught opened the discussion, as he had been requested, by reading an article, prepared for the occasion, which formed the basis of the book lately published. At this meeting, the Rev. Dr. Baylee (of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead) "urged that there was no logical resting-place between verbal inspiration and atheism. A man must either believe that every *word* of Scripture was inspired, or he ought (logically) to deny the existence of a God!" The Rev. S. Minton "said that he would not stoop to pick up a Bible which might

lie at his feet, unless he thought it was the Infallible Word of God." The Rev. J. B. Lowe "charged Mr. Macnaught with denying the Inspiration of the Bible;" whereupon the President (Dr. M'Neile) said, fairly enough, that "the clergy should be very careful to quote one another rightly; and that it was the Inspirational Infallibility of Holy Writ, and not its Inspiration, that Mr. Macnaught had questioned." (P. 13.) After these expressions of opinion, and others to a similar effect, Mr. Macnaught states that he sounded one of the members, the Rev. William Pollock, as to the propriety of absenting himself from the next meeting, and getting the Chairman to ascertain how far his continued membership would be agreeable to the Society. This course he states that he was urged not to take. It seems to us, however, that this proposal on Mr. Macnaught's part at so early a stage, is not very consistent with his indignant amazement at his subsequent expulsion. He proceeds to state that for fifteen months he continued to attend the meetings of the Society, taking part in the discussions, and to be on the best of terms with its members. This does not bear out his previous assertion of an organized and hostile determination to crush and expel him.

Chapter iii. informs us that in April of the present year a discussion took place on the Example of Christ and its Limitations. The opener, the Rev. T. C. Cowan, urged that Jesus was not in many respects, for various reasons, a proper example for us. Mr. Macnaught maintained that he should be in all things our example, even in his sufferings, and quoted the sacrificial language applied by Paul and John to the sufferings endured by followers of Christ, more especially the remarkable expression in Col. i. 24, "I fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh," which implied that the sufferings of Christ must have been "in *some* sense deficient." This excited a shudder in the meeting; Mr. Pollock "bemoaned, in a lachrymose voice, that 'his dear friend and brother Mr. Macnaught was preaching Antichrist;'" and the Ven. Chairman, "in a state of great emotion," followed on the same side.

Chapter iv. records at great length and in minute detail a private visit from Dr. M'Neile to Mr. Macnaught, after the publication of his book, which he seems to have sent to the press without consultation with any of his brethren. Not that he was bound to consult them; but we cannot wonder that they felt startled and committed by his public avowal of such bold and far-going views. The declared object of Dr. M'Neile's visit was to suggest the propriety of Mr. Macnaught's retiring from the Society, inasmuch as there was no longer any common ground between him and the other members. Mr. Macnaught disputed this, observing that those who considered the Bible to be infallible were all fallible in their various interpretations of it, and therefore that they did not differ from him in practical result. He further said that he did not feel disposed to retire privately from the Society, because he thought it would place him in a false position, and seem to indicate cowardice or a consciousness of error. He also felt it to be his duty to remain where he might learn wisdom from his older brethren. They then discussed the subject of the sufferings of Christ, when Mr. Macnaught explained that what he understood by "filling up that which was behind" was, that the followers of Christ must exert themselves at much self-sacrifice (as missionaries to the heathen, for example) to carry the glad tidings of the gospel to those who could not otherwise receive any benefit from it.



With this explanation Dr. M'Neile seemed to be satisfied on that point; and we do not quite understand why Mr. Macnaught had not given this explanation at the meeting. It looks rather as if he wished to make a sensation by needlessly startling words. On other points, "imputed righteousness" and "vicarious suffering" (which had not been brought before the Society), Dr. M'Neile differed from him, but they parted with many friendly expressions. Mr. Macnaught lays repeated stress on the "treachery" of Dr. M'Neile in thus privately visiting him as a friend, and afterwards promoting his expulsion from the Society. We have no disposition to be partial in favour of Dr. M'Neile, but we must say that, looking at the matter from his point of view, we cannot see that Mr. Macnaught had much reason to complain. Dr. M'Neile made no secret of his desire that Mr. Macnaught should quietly retire from the Society, and, on his declining to do so, expressly said that he was himself free, then, to pursue whatever course he thought fit.

The above interview took place (as we learn from Chapter v.) three days before the next meeting of the Society, held on May 5, when the subject announced for discussion was the Existence and Power of Satan. After the usual hymn and prayer, the Secretary (Rev. J. Herbert Jones) said that he was instructed by the Committee of Management to give the following notice:

"The Rev. John Macnaught having avowed in meetings of this Society sentiments respecting the Inspiration of Scripture and the Atonement of Christ's death which are contrary to the deepest convictions of its members,

"Resolved—That he be no longer considered a member of this Society."—  
P. 24.

The Rev. Dr. Baylee rose and said he should be prepared to move that resolution at the next meeting. The Rev. J. S. Howson (Principal of the Collegiate Institution) said he should be happy to second it. Mr. Macnaught, who was completely taken by surprise, on attempting to address the meeting, was stopped by Dr. M'Neile, who rose to order, there being no proposition before the meeting, and the Ven. Chairman immediately called on the Rev. J. Evans to open the discussion on the subject announced for the evening; in the course of which discussion, Mr. Macnaught, calling attention to the fact that disease and sickness were spoken of in the New Testament as the work of demons, and considering the manner in which Wisdom was personified in the book of Proverbs, inquired "whether it was theologically necessary to believe in *personal devils* in order to account for the undeniable existence and power of evil." (P. 25.) We feel amused at the share which Mr. Macnaught reports himself as having taken in the different discussions that he specifies. Certainly, if he was suspected of being "a black sheep," his remarks did not tend to remove the suspicion. If the accuracy of Mr. Macnaught's report is to be depended upon, he was not the only member who uttered startling opinions. For example: "In the course of the discussion, Mr. Howson remarked that his difficulty was not to believe in the Devil. Of that he found abundant proof in himself and in everything. His difficulty was to believe in a God." (P. 25.) Contemplating what he would perhaps call the diabolical treatment with which he had just been threatened, Mr. Macnaught might naturally have exclaimed in response to the above sentiment, *Eccce signum!* At the close of the meeting, he requested Dr. M'Neile to put in writing his

verbal statement that his visit to himself had been "*proprio motu*, and without consultation with his brethren of the Managing Committee." On the following day he wrote to the Secretary, asking what Rule of the Society he had broken, and what was the proposed order of proceeding. He also corresponded with Dr. M'Neile, to elicit from him a statement of the fact that there had been no consultation of the Committee previous to the 5th of May, the very day of the meeting at which the notice was given. Mr. Macnaught urges that a deputation ought to have waited upon him "to make some peaceful and gentlemanly arrangement for his retirement;" or that a Rule should have been passed, "limiting the freedom of discussion within certain bounds, and providing for" the exclusion of any member "who in speech or publication should exceed those limits;" in which case, he says, the author of such a book as his "would be sure to retire from the Society." (P. 28.) This admission seems to us to prove that, though the Committee of Management may have been harsh and hasty in their mode of proceeding, Mr. Macnaught has no substantial ground of complaint against them, always remembering that they were the Committee of a "Clerical Society."

We will not trouble our readers with the contents of Chapter vii., detailing alleged imputations on Mr. Macnaught's "moral character" by Mr. Jones, the Secretary; which, from the circumstantial statement here given, were not merely without foundation, but expressly contradicted by facts, Mr. Macnaught having acted with perfect propriety, and Mr. Jones having been not only aided and benefited by him in one of the transactions referred to, but, moreover, *himself* the object of the reproach (such as it is) which he attempts to fasten on his friend.

In Chapter viii. we learn that Mr. Macnaught wrote to Dr. Baylee and to Dr. M'Neile to inquire what was to be alleged against him. Dr. M'Neile replied in general terms. Dr. Baylee replied by stating what portions of his published book he meant to bring forward for comment. To this, Mr. Macnaught objected that the discussion ought to turn, not upon anything he had published, but upon what he had said in meetings of the Society. Here we must say that we think Mr. Macnaught was quibbling about technical matters. His book, he himself tells us, is the substance, with additions, of what he had read to the Society, and the publication of his views of course committed the Society, to some extent, so long as he remained a member. We think Dr. Baylee right in replying that it was more just to Mr. Macnaught to bring forward his carefully considered published statements than his verbal declarations on the same subject.

In Chapter ix., Mr. Macnaught reports the proceedings of the final meeting, at which he was expelled. He took notes of the various remarks made, copies of which he afterwards sent to the various speakers for their correction. The Ven. Chairman and some others refused to correct them, on the ground that it was against the Rules of the Society to publish their proceedings without their consent; which Mr. Macnaught acknowledges, but rejoins that his expulsion was itself not justified by any of the Society's Rules, and therefore that he is no longer bound to observe them. When Dr. Baylee had moved the resolution, the case was ably and temperately stated by Mr. Howson, the seconder, in a paper which he read. The Rev. R. W. Hiley (one of the Masters in the Collegiate Institution) moved an amendment, amounting merely to

a protest against Mr. Macnaught's views, which was seconded by the Rev. James Laurence. The mover represented that Mr. Macnaught was a young man, whose views might change, and that if he were expelled "he would be cut off from all the Liverpool clergy, and, having no associates left him, he would be driven to seek out Martineau or Francis Newman and others, leaders of the principles so justly deprecated." \* Mr. Macnaught then read his defence, in which he protested against the whole proceeding as irregular and unjust, asking what would be the effect of establishing a law that any member expressing sentiments contrary to the deepest convictions of the other members, should be expelled from the Society. He reproached Dr. M'Neile with treachery, the Secretary with slander, and Dr. Baylee with keenness in accusing a brother-clergyman of heresy, as demonstrated on a previous occasion in an unsuccessful attempt to induce the Bishop of Chester to withdraw his licence from his curate and fellow-professor, Mr. Labarte. He suggested that the regular course to get rid of any member really guilty of blasphemy or heresy, was by an appeal to the Bishop or the Courts in order to deprive him of his gown, when he would, *ipso facto*, cease to be a member of a Clerical Society. He called attention to the fact that, after the expression of his sentiments on Inspiration, he was for many months on the best terms with the other members, and was even appointed and urged to remain Secretary of the Liverpool Liturgical Revision Association. With regard to the Atonement, he reminded the meeting that it had never been brought before them for discussion so as to give him an opportunity of fully expressing his views, and proceeded to quote, from Archbishops Tillotson and Magee, as expressive of his own opinion, passages denying that God could not have forgiven sin without the death of Christ, affirming that the death of Christ emanated from the Father's love, and maintaining only that it was in some way efficacious for our benefit in saving us from wrath. He objected to the term "meritorious" as unscriptural and, to say the least, ambiguous, seeming to imply the mediæval doctrine of merits. He then fully explained his meaning in reference to Col. i. 24, adducing the translations of various commentators, including Conybeare and Howson, as consistent with his interpretation. His defence (of which the above is a very brief outline) would have been much more practically effective, we think, with the omission of much of the technical matter and of the personal sarcasms in which he indulged. At its close, Mr. Howson candidly stated that Mr. Macnaught had entirely removed his unfavourable impression of what he had formerly said on Col. i. 24. Various other members then expressed their sentiments; among them, Dr. Hume, whose own report of his remarks is amusingly (and characteristically) decorated with various cries of approbation which his *memory* (the italics are Mr. Macnaught's) has supplied. He spoke to the point of expelling a member on the ground of what had taken

---

\* Here Mr. Macnaught appends the following note: "Mr. Hiley is pleased to be patronising. Mr. Macnaught would be glad to have the friendship of good and honest men, like Mr. Martineau or Mr. F. Newman, however widely their opinions and Mr. M.'s may differ. But, meanwhile, the compassionate Mr. Hiley will be glad to hear, what will apparently surprise him, that there are in the world—yea, and in Liverpool too—some wise and pious men, lay and clerical, from whose friendship and society even his expulsion from the Clerical Society has not wholly excluded Mr. Macnaught."—P. 50.



place out of the Society, and referred to the case of Dr. Lardner's retirement from learned Societies (by which he anticipated his expulsion) after running away with another man's wife,—an illustration, the good taste and appropriateness of which Mr. Macnaught leaves to the judgment of his readers.\* The Rev. C. E. Titterton then spoke manfully *against* the resolution, calling attention to the views of Maurice, Jowett, Baden Powell, &c., and deprecating the prohibition of discussion, which he looked upon as the means of coming to right conclusions. The Rev. J. Bardsley repelled the consideration that Mr. Macnaught should be excused as being a young man. In the course of his remarks he said,—

"I am firmly persuaded, and therefore do not hesitate to declare it, that Mr. Macnaught's teaching in his book on Inspiration is more dangerous and destructive than anything that has been advanced by either Dr. Wiseman or Mr. Martineau. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Macnaught can be regarded as an inexperienced young man, after publishing a seven-and-six-penny book on Inspiration."—P. 79.

Dr. Baylee, in replying, after saying that "he should take no notice of the foolish things which had been said about personal matters," proceeded to say, with what looks like malignant satisfaction,—

"He had once had a curate who (as Dr. B. could prove in a court of law) had stated in his pulpit that 'Christ in no sense bore our sins.' On an appeal being made to the Bishop, his Lordship had taken part with the young man, *under the impression that he (Dr. Baylee) was acting oppressively*. The young man had since left this diocese; had been in an Irish curacy some time; and since then *had been wandering about much in want of employment*."—P. 81.

The Ven. Chairman, in putting the motion, maintained the propriety of referring to Mr. Macnaught's book, rejected the plea of his alleged youth, characterized his proceedings as one continued quibble about facts and words, and intimated (with what, from an Archdeacon, certainly looks something like a threat) that any one voting for the amendment would do it "*in spite of the original motion*." Four hands only were held up for Mr. Hiley's amendment. Against it, an immense majority. Before the original resolution was put, Mr. Howson stated that Mr. Macnaught's explanation about the Atonement had narrowed the ground on which he rested his vote, but that in another respect, viz. his "litigious spirit," he had given him a new reason for it. Mr. Macnaught here appends a note, in which he sarcastically supposes "that if a lad at the Collegiate Institution is falsely accused, and stoutly denies and carefully disproves the calumny, the Principal gives him a double *whacking* for his 'litigious spirit' of self-vindication."

The vote was taken by each member giving his opinion publicly. Fifty-five voted for the resolution, four against, three declined voting, fifteen were not present.

We believe that this expulsion of Mr. Macnaught from the Clerical Society has not thinned the crowded and deeply-interested congregation at St. Chrysostom's church, and that there is a strong feeling of sympathy with him even among members of his own religious community.

The attentive perusal which we have given to the eighty-eight closely printed pages of his pamphlet, makes us wish that he had confined himself more closely to the general questions at issue, and not occupied

---

\* Dr. Hume, it may be mentioned, is one of the clergy familiarly known in Liverpool as "the Irish Brigade."

himself so much with merely personal matters and technical points. Of course *we* think it would have been wiser and better if the Society had met him only with argument in fair discussion, so long as he himself conscientiously believed that he held no opinions incompatible with his position in the Church of England. But, looking at the matter from our Dissenting point of view, we must repeat that we cannot wonder at a voluntary association of "Evangelical" clergymen coming to the conclusion that there was a fundamental difference between them and a man holding Mr. Macnaught's published views, rendering it impossible for them to discuss theological points together with harmony or advantage. We cannot see, from Mr. Macnaught's own statement, that the leading members of the Society were necessarily actuated by any unfriendly or unworthy feeling in reference to himself. However false and narrow we may deem their theological principles, we cannot say that they have acted inconsistently with the doctrines to which, as clergymen of the Established Church, they had solemnly declared their unfeigned assent. It is certainly pleasant to find that there are in that Church able and earnest men who seem surprised that any objection should be raised against the most free and fearless discussion of theological questions; but, with the Book of Common Prayer before us, we cannot join in their surprise. If they would be free indeed, they must be no longer entangled with this yoke of bondage, but "come out from among them," and walk forth into the liberty with which Christ has made *us* free.\*

J. R.

---

\* We refer our readers to the report of the proceedings of Mr. Macnaught and his friends, on the occasion of his receiving from them a testimonial and address. See *Inquirer*, Sept. 13, 1856. With most of the sentiments then and there expressed we cordially sympathize; but we must be permitted to wonder that a clergyman who has given in his assent and consent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, should feel at liberty to think and speak as Mr. Macnaught does in behalf of free inquiry and against the system of his Church, the results of which, when rigorously enforced, he admits to be, "casuistry, imbecility and hypocrisy." So thought John Milton, and therefore he refused, as he terms it, to "subscribe slave." If Mr. Macnaught and his flock will cast off the bondage of the Articles and Creeds of the Church of England, and thus vindicate their right to think freely and speak fearlessly, they may be assured they will confer a *lasting* benefit on the cause of mental freedom and scriptural truth. We do not deny that they are at present furthering that cause. But they are in a false position, and their inconsistency takes away much of the grace and force of their example. Their position is, we believe, that of tens of thousands of the laity and some few of the clergy of the Church—Nonconformists at heart, but lacking the resolution to proclaim themselves *Dissenters*.—ED. C. R.

## INTELLIGENCE.

REV. G. V. SMITH, PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY  
IN MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

Our readers have probably learnt from another quarter the fact that the Rev. G. Vance Smith has resigned his office of Professor of Theology in our College, and that that resignation will take effect at the close of the ensuing session of 1856-7. The correspondence which we now print will shew what are the feelings of a considerable portion of the Committee, including some much-honoured names, towards Mr. Smith—how highly they appreciate his learning and past services—and how much they regret the circumstances which have severed his connection with the College.

*Rev. John Kenrick to Rev. G. V. Smith.*

Sept. 2, 1856.

My dear Sir,—I have much pleasure in forwarding to you an Address, expressive of the feelings of regret and sympathy which the dissolution of your connection with Manchester College has awakened in the minds of many members of the Committee. It would have been placed sooner in your hands but for the dispersion of the subscribers.

Mr. Colston's absence from England has prevented an application for his signature, which otherwise, I am sure, he would gladly have affixed.

Believe me, yours very truly,  
JOHN KENRICK.

Rev. G. Vance Smith.

*To the Reverend George Vance Smith,  
Professor of Theology in Manchester  
New College.*

Dear Sir,—As Members of the Committee of Manchester New College, we feel ourselves called upon to express to you our deep regret at the circumstances which have led to the approaching termination of your connection with that Institution. By the accidental majority of a single vote, it has been determined to accept the offer of the resignation of your office, which a sense of duty and a feeling of honour had induced you to make. We are therefore anxious to assure you, with whatever authority may belong to our individual names and our opportunities of judging, that we believe you to have been faithful and laborious in your endeavours to ac-

quire and to communicate knowledge; that your desire and aim has been, without dogmatically imposing your own opinions on your pupils—a practice wholly foreign to the principles and the traditions of Manchester New College—to enable them to form sound conclusions on all the great questions of Theology and Biblical Criticism. We are confident also that the reputation of the College as a School of Theological Learning, and the character of the students for ministerial attainments and usefulness, have suffered no diminution during the time that you have presided over its studies.

With the expression of our conviction of the loss which the College will sustain by your removal, we beg to join the assurance of our high personal esteem, and our hope that, when your connection with us ceases, you may find some sphere of professional exertion in which your services may be more justly appreciated and more gratefully acknowledged, than they have been by those for whose benefit you have laboured. We subscribe ourselves

Your faithful friends and servants,

JOHN KENRICK, Visitor.

WILLIAM GASKELL, Chairman  
of the Committee.

R. BROOK ASPLAND, Secretary.

EDDOWES BOWMAN, Classical  
Examiner.

J. ASPINALL TURNER, late Chair-  
man of the Committee.

SAMUEL ROBINSON.

JOHN CROPPER.

*Rev. G. V. Smith to Rev. John Kenrick.*

70, Oakley Square, Sept. 4th.

My dear Sir,—I have to-day received your note, enclosing a short Address to myself, signed by you and other members of the College Committee. I cordially thank you and them for this expression of your esteem and good-will. It has, I assure you, been no small consolation to me, amidst the grief and anxiety occasioned by the occurrences of the last few months, to think that yourself and other friends so well qualified to judge justly, should have been able to give me so much of your support and sympathy.

Thanking you again most warmly for this additional proof of your regard,

I remain, dear Sir, yours sincerely,  
G. VANCE SMITH.

Rev. John Kenrick.



GLASGOW UNITARIAN CHURCH.

We insert in our present number an excellent lithograph of the exterior of the new Glasgow Unitarian church. There appears every reason to hope that, through the instrumentality of this church, Unitarianism will gain a firm and strong position in Glasgow. The members of the congregation are united in good feeling among themselves and in attachment to their minister, and the general management of the affairs of the church is well and faithfully conducted. Since the opening of the new building, many new seatholders have been enrolled. In addition to the usual services, a special service for children is regularly conducted by the Rev. H. W. Crosskey, and various classes are about to be established with a view to furnish a regular course of religious instruction to the younger members. The morning services are of a devotional character, for the positive culture of Christian faith and ethics; while in evening lectures the distinctive principles of our faith are brought before the public mind.

None but those who have lived in Scotland know the peculiar difficulties Unitarianism has to encounter. The normal state of public opinion is Calvinistic to an extent only developed in England in a few abnormal cases; and what would be deemed extreme orthodoxy south of the Border, is moderate in Glasgow. In addition to the numerous and influential, but conscientious, open antagonists, there are also to be encountered a number of men who seek every excuse to justify themselves for unfaithfulness to their convictions, and who, in self-defence of their own conscious dishonesty, are not unsparing in misrepresentations of the Unitarian church.

The warmest sympathy of our friends is due to a congregation which, in the midst of so many difficulties, is faithful to those noble Christian principles on which the spiritual freedom and religious life of Christendom will ultimately depend.

---

WARWICKSHIRE UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The fiftieth annual general meeting of this Society was held in the Old Meeting-house, Birmingham, on Wednesday, August 27. Though only two years had elapsed since the previous

annual meeting in Birmingham, it was thought expedient that this Jubilee should be held in the town in which the Society originated, and which is still the centre of its operations. The introductory devotional services were conducted by the Rev. Wm. Bowen, of Kingswood, who read Psalm c. and Matthew xx. 1—16, as the lessons of the day; after which the Rev. John Gordon, of Edinburgh, preached from Revelation ii. 1—5, reviewing in his discourse the progress of the religious life among us during the last half century, and powerfully applying the commendation and warning addressed to the early Ephesian church to our own admonition and encouragement. As Mr. Gordon has kindly consented to place his discourse in the hands of the Committee for publication, we shall not attempt even a brief analysis of it, but refer our readers to the discourse itself, which they will find on perusal fully answering to the character given of it in the vote of thanks in which it was acknowledged, as "able, seasonable, instructive, and eminently Christian."

At the meeting for business, which immediately followed the religious services, the chair was taken by the Rev. Charles Clarke. The Treasurer explained the diminished balance in hand which his statement of account exhibited, by the fact that a larger number of subscribers than usual had claimed their tracts during the past year, thus making the Society more efficient than ever for its contemplated purposes. The Secretary announced that the List of Books had been drawn up with the view of supplying works adapted for the maintenance and diffusion of doctrinal truth, and also works adapted for the cultivation of devotional feeling, though they might not be strictly in accordance with Unitarian theology; and instanced the beautiful *Lyra Germanica*, recently translated by Miss Winkworth, among works of this latter class, which he felt sure that the members of the Society would rejoice to have thus recommended to their notice. The Secretary also gave the following complete list of the officers of the Society from its commencement fifty years ago:

Treasurers:

1806—1811, Mr. John Lawrence.  
1811—1833, Mr. Richard Peyton.  
1833—1837, Mr. Jeremiah Ridout.  
1837—1849, Mr. John Francis.  
1849— Mr. Charles Clifford.

## Secretaries :

1806—1811, Rev. Josh. Toulmin, D.D.  
 1811—1823, Rev. Jas. Hews Bransby.  
 1823—1827, Rev. Hugh Hutton, M.A.  
 1827—1838, Rev. John Reynell Wre-  
 ford (now D.D.).  
 1838—1844, Rev. John Howard Ryland.  
 1844— Rev. Samuel Bache.

About sixty ladies and gentlemen subsequently dined together, under the able presidency of Mr. Alderman Baldwin; and proceeded in the evening to a tea-party in the large school-room adjoining the Old Meeting-house, which had been tastefully decorated for the occasion, and was completely filled by the subscribers to the Society and their friends. Over this meeting the Rev. Charles Clarke presided with eminent ability and success. Various topics affecting our interests as a religious body were eloquently introduced by the Chairman and freely discussed by gentlemen present; and the intervals between these addresses were admirably filled up by the singing of the choir of the Old Meeting-house, who had contributed no less effectually to the interest of the religious services in the morning. We shall not attempt any outline of these addresses, but will content ourselves with remarking that those who heard it will not soon forget the Rev. John Gordon's truly eloquent and graphic sketch of the present state of religious profession and life in Scotland; or (at a later part of the evening) the manly and earnest appeal of Mr. Herbert New, of Evesham, to his brethren among the laity to improve the opportunities which business and social intercourse afford *them*, so much more than their ministers, for the exposition and maintenance of their religious convictions. It is hoped, too, that some of the remarks made by the Secretary on the subject of a Free Press, may not prove altogether ineffectual; when, after shewing the incalculable importance of a free press to the maintenance and diffusion of both truth and liberty, he reminded the meeting that this Jubilee of the Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society was also the Jubilee of "The CHRISTIAN REFORMER," which having been commenced in the year 1806, under the title of "The Monthly Repository," by the late Rev. Robert Aspland, of Hackney, has been continued down to the present time in the hands of his son, the Rev. Robt. Brook Aspland, of Dukinfield, for the exposition and maintenance of the same vital

truths and principles as were contemplated in its first establishment. The Secretary expressed his conviction that it is peculiarly incumbent on the members of our Tract Societies, and on the Unitarian body in general, to support with zeal and steadfastness this enlightened, long-tried, faithful, consistent and persevering advocate of Christian truth and liberty, and to secure for both ministers and people among us so suitable an organ for the publication of our opinions.

A cordial vote of thanks to the Rev. Charles Clarke for his various and valuable services throughout the day, closed at a rather late hour in the evening this very interesting and successful celebration of the Jubilee of the Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society. May its next Jubilee be yet more successful!

---

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON  
THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL.

We have much pleasure in inserting and calling attention to the following document, which entitles itself to the respectful attention not merely of Unitarian Christians, but of all that respect religious liberty and love fair dealing. We trust there will be no hesitation on the part of the English Unitarians in supplying the Committee (Mr. Mark Philips being the Treasurer) with the funds necessary to enable them to prosecute this matter to a satisfactory conclusion. The firmer the position taken by the Unitarian body, the less danger is there of the necessity of an enforced legal remedy.

The Committee appointed at the meeting of Unitarians held at Birmingham on the 30th October, 1855, to consider and take the best means of carrying out the resolutions of that meeting, designed to prevent the continued perversion of the Borough-Road School from its original catholic unsectarian basis to the systematic inculcation of a peculiar creed, report the steps they have taken in pursuance of those resolutions.

It appeared to them, in the first instance, desirable to obtain the opinion of counsel, other than those who had already been consulted, as to the course to be pursued to obtain relief from the injury suffered by persons not of Trinitarian persuasions by the inculcation of peculiar religious opinions, and as to the probable result of proceedings in equity.

The counsel selected by the Committee were Mr. W. M. James, Q.C., and Mr.

Wickens, before whom were laid the various pamphlets relating to the British and Foreign School Society published by Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Dunn, and also the Case and Further Case laid before Sir John Jervis and Mr. Rolt, with their opinions thereon.

Several members of your Committee were also present at a lengthened consultation with Mr. James and Mr. Wickens. The opinion of those gentlemen, as expressed both at the consultation and in writing, was, that the oral inculcation of any peculiar religious opinions was a violation of the principles on which the Society was founded, and that the dogmas distinguishing what are commonly called Orthodox opinions from Arian or Unitarian opinions, were peculiar opinions which ought not to be inculcated; and that on the fact of such violation being established, redress would be afforded by the Courts of Equity.

Mr. Dunn in his publications has stated most strongly that the present usage of the School as to doctrinal teaching has been pursued from the first. The Committee therefore deemed it also a matter of the greatest importance to obtain a complete and altogether reliable history of the British and Foreign School Society from its earliest days. This task was undertaken by Mr. Leyson Lewis, who has prepared the accompanying Historical Statement from a careful perusal of all the Reports published by the Society, the Parliamentary Blue-books, and other authentic sources of information mentioned in the Appendix to the Statement. A glance at it will shew that great time and labour were necessarily devoted to its preparation, and will, it is hoped, sufficiently account for the interval which has elapsed between the appointment of the Committee and the appearance of any report of their proceedings.

The Institution was founded by the united efforts of Episcopalians, Roman Catholics, Quakers, Unitarians and Dissenters of all other denominations, conjoined with the great leaders of the Liberal party in this kingdom, particularly the Dukes of Kent and Sussex and Bedford. It has obtained large legacies purely and simply because it was an unsectarian Institution. It has obtained grants from Government because it is considered to represent the educational interests of all sects of the community, in contradistinction to the National Schools, which are confined exclusively to one only. It becomes therefore the duty, not of Unitarians alone, but of all who desire to see public funds applied to their legitimate

purposes, to use their best exertions to prevent a continued systematic and, as it is truly pretended, unavoidable departure from those principles upon which the Institution was based, and by a supposed adherence to which it has attained its present importance. For the public to consent to its degradation to sectarian objects as inevitable, is to condemn the Irish system of National Education as impracticable and dishonest, and to admit that education by each sect for itself is in the nature of things a matter of unavoidable necessity.

The Committee will continue their efforts to attain the objects for which they were appointed, and will make a further report so soon as they have determined upon what shall appear to them the best course of action. In the mean time, they invite suggestions or communications, which may be addressed to the Hon. Sec., Mr. H. J. Preston, 10, Austin Friars, London.

While the Committee are fully impressed with the desirability of avoiding litigation if the managers of the Borough-Road Schools can be induced by any other means to abstain from their present avowed deviation from the Society's original catholicity, they feel bound to advise recourse to legal proceedings if justice can be obtained by no other means.

#### OPENING OF THE NEW UNITARIAN CHAPEL AT BOLTON, LANCASHIRE.\*

On Thursday, Aug. 21, the opening services took place, and were attended by friends from various places in the counties of Lancaster and Chester. Amongst the laymen, we noticed Mr. Robert Heywood; Mr. Crook, M.P.; Mr. Andrews, of Rivington Hall; Mr. David Harrison, of Stalybridge; Mr. Biggs, of London; Mr. Jas. Ogden, of Dukinfield Hall; Mr. John Long, of Knutsford; Mr. Shaw, of Park Lane; Mr. Edmund Grundy, of Bury; Mr. R. D. Darbshire, Mr. John Shuttleworth, Mr. Thomas Baker and Mr. Grundy, of Manchester; Mr. Mortimer Maurice, &c. &c. There were present twenty-six ministers of religion, viz., Rev. James Whitehead, of Ainsworth; Rev. F. Baker, and Rev. Robert Best, Independent minister, of Bolton; Rev. John Wright, of Bury; Rev. M. C. Frankland, of Chowbent; Rev. R. B. Aspland, of Dukinfield; Rev. John Gordon, of Edinburgh; Rev. Charles Beard, of Gee Cross; Rev. R. C. Jones,

\* Continued from p. 569.



of Gateacre; Rev. G. H. Wells, of Gorton; Rev. J. K. Montgomery, of Huddersfield; Rev. Henry Green, of Knutsford; Rev. William Herford and Rev. G. Barmby, of Lancaster; Rev. T. E. Poynting, of Monton; Rev. J. P. Ham, Rev. Dr. Beard and Rev. A. W. Worthington, of Manchester; Rev. C. W. Robberds, of Oldham; Rev. John Robberds, of the Park, Liverpool; Rev. Joseph Ashton, of Preston; Rev. Wm. Smith, of Rochdale; Rev. Jas. Bayley, of Stockport; Rev. J. S. Gilbert, of Rivington; Rev. William Probert, of Walmsley; and Rev. P. P. Carpenter, of Warrington. Long before the services began, the chapel was thronged by friends inquisitively examining the building, which appeared to give unmingled satisfaction both in its general contour and its ornamental finish. It is proper to mention that some things have been added by way of presents from individual members of the congregation. A service of plate for communion, consisting of flagon, two chalices and plate, out of money presented by a lady to Rev. F. Baker. The ladies of the congregation have also presented their minister with handsome pulpit robes. The clock was given by Mrs. Baker. The Bible and Hymn-books (Mr. Martineau's Selection, just adopted in lieu of the Exeter Collection, now out of print) for pulpit and communion-table, by Mrs. Thomas Scowcroft and Mrs. Richard Harwood; the pulpit cushion, by Mrs. Heywood; and the chairs within the communion rails, by Mr. Richard Harwood. When the hour appointed for the opening service arrived, the chapel was nearly filled in every part with an intelligent and deeply-interested audience, consisting in about equal proportions of the two sexes. Mr. Rawson presided at the organ, which is the instrument used in the former chapel, with considerable internal additions and improvements, and a new and handsome case suitable to the new building in which it is placed; and the hymns, anthems, &c., were executed with admirable effect by Miss Sarah Armstrong, of Manchester, and a well-selected choir. The first hymn satisfactorily decided the question whether the building was suited for music, vocal and instrumental; and the ease with which the voices of the ministers who conducted the service reached the most distant portions of the spacious building, removed every remaining doubt as to its suitability for public speaking. The Rev. Franklin

Baker began the devotional service, and dedicated the building to the worship of God in a prayer which was at once appropriate and deeply solemn. He also read the Scriptures, the lesson from the Old Testament being taken from Psalm lxxxvi., and that from the New Testament, St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians, i. and ii. The long prayer was given by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, who was also the preacher on the occasion.

Mr. Aspland took as his text 2 Chron. ii. 4, 5, 6 (in part): "Behold, I build a house to the name of Jehovah my God, to dedicate it to him. \* \* \* And the house which I build is great, for great is our God above all gods. But who is able to build Him a house, seeing the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain Him? Who am I then that I should build Him a house?" After illustrating the text, and touching briefly on the contradictions and absurdities involved in the Atheistic theory, the preacher dwelt on the great subject of God's omnipresence, which he shewed was involved in the Divine Unity, every violation of his Unity tending to represent him as a local Deity. To the Scriptures he traced all the sublime ideas now possessed by mankind on God's omnipresence; and, contrasting the low and abject ideas entertained on this subject by even the most cultivated men of the heathen world, he derived an argument for the essential (*not verbal*) inspiration of Holy Writ. The preacher then illustrated in detail the spiritual and practical lessons which his subject taught. In the latter part of his discourse, he shewed that the omnipresence of God is the reason of prayer and other acts of worship. Under this head, he exposed the miserable superstition of holy places and holy orders; remarking,—“On no subject were our Presbyterian forefathers more distinct and earnest than on this. One of the noble Bartholomean confessors, on taking his enforced farewell of his flock on the 17th of August, 1662, said, ‘In the gospel, under the new covenant, God doth not tie us to ceremonies or places. He doth not bind us, as he did the Jews, to go three times in the year to the furthestmost parts of the nation to worship. No land, no ground, is now unholy. Every place is now a Judæa, every house is a Jerusalem, every congregation is now a Sion.’ In the spirit of our forefathers we are ready to say, that whatever be the place that excites

virtuous sentiments, pious recollections and Christian hopes, whether the magnificent fabric that has been the work of ages and that generations in succession have frequented and admired, or the convenient and graceful structure of yesterday,—whether it be the mansion or the hovel, the crowded mart or the sequestered walk, the spacious vault or the secret closet, the habitation of cheerfulness or the house of mourning,—we will say of it with equal solemnity, ‘Surely Jehovah is in this place. This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.’ We admire and honour the gospel simplicity and the personal self-denial of the ejected clergy and their faithful flocks in their time of trial. Almost without a murmur (of this the *Farewell Sermons* that were printed are a remarkable proof) they quitted at the call of conscience the majestic cathedrals and the solemn and beautiful churches in which they and their fathers had been wont to worship. We wrong them if we suppose they were insensible to the solemn beauty of these buildings, and their own loss in being ejected from them. They had eyes to see, and they had hearts to feel. Like the great poet, who was the personal friend of some of them, they doubtless were wont

To walk the studious cloister's pale,  
And loved the high embowed roof,  
With antick pillars massy proof,  
And storied windows richly dight,  
Casting a dim religious light.

But they knew that there were better things than these. They thought pure worship was better than a costly temple, and an unstained conscience than an imposing ritual and a rich establishment. In the days of persecution they met contentedly in the upper room, on the hill-side, the quiet valley or sheltered wood. In the succeeding days of indulgence and toleration, of which they eagerly used the privileges, but in the continuance of which they had little confidence, they were happy to meet their brethren in the hired hall or in the dwelling-house of their long-silenced pastor. The modest meeting-houses, built after such models, which everywhere arose when religious liberty was assured to the Nonconformists of England, were at once the assertion of their own simple faith, and their protest against that superstition which made religion consist in stone walls, carved altars and priestly vestments.

2 s 2

If need were, we would still worship in the simple structures raised by the piety of our forefathers. But there is a charm to the mind, as well as to the eye, in the varied and graceful forms of ecclesiastical architecture. In proportion to the interest we take in the services of the house of God, is our desire to see it partake of the advantages of modern art. While our own houses abound in comforts, and some of them shine in beauty, we are not willing that the house of God should be rude in form and bare of every decoration. In raising, then, graceful and beautiful buildings like that in which we have to-day assembled, we have no intention of deserting any one important principle of our honoured Nonconformist ancestors. But, in truth, we virtually honour their memory and teaching by avoiding a superstitious reverence even of their foundations. Be it ours to carry into new and more costly houses of prayer their pure faith and tenderness of conscience, their indomitable integrity and unflinching Nonconformity.” The preacher then dwelt with much earnestness on the necessity of sincerity and integrity in all religious services. He alluded with pity to the intellectual haziness of the minds of some men of the present day, and with indignant warmth to the time-serving of others who, while claiming to be actuated by Luther's spirit of honest reformation, clung to churches in the symbols of which they had ceased to have faith. He contrasted the mystical no-meaning, the hesitation and inconsistency, of such men, with the outspoken truth and courage of the ejected clergy of 1662. To his Unitarian hearers he appealed to exhibit habitually the fearless, and at the same time expansive and benignant spirit, which became the sincere, trusting and loving worshipers of an omnipresent God and Father.

In conclusion, the preacher said,—“The occasion of this day's assembly and of this solemn service is one of deep interest, not only to the members of the Christian society who stately worship on this spot, but to all who attach importance to the preservation and diffusion of pure religion in this locality. If any stranger were to ask the members of this church, ‘Who hath commanded you to build this house?’ you might answer, in the words of some pious Hebrews recorded in the Old Testament (*Ezra v. 13*), spoken in reply to a similar question put by the mes-

sengers of Darius, 'We are the servants of the God of heaven and earth, and build the house that was builded many years ago, which a great king of Israel builded and set up.' Imperfectly as I have this morning described the attribute of the omnipresence of the God of heaven and earth, you will, I trust, accept my statement as explanatory of the sentiments which have induced you to rear this beautiful house of prayer, and to dedicate it to the worship of the benignant Author of your lives, whose spirit is diffused through the universe. Your work needs no special act of consecration. It consecrates itself. It was solemnly dedicated by the prayer of your pastor. Disclaiming on this occasion everything of the *priestly* function, I simply desire to utter, in the spirit of Christian sympathy, the friendly wishes and the religious aspirations proper to the occasion.

"May this house of prayer be to you, and to many successive generations of worshippers, the house of God and the gate of Heaven! Here may your hearts have peaceful and joyful communion with your Father in Heaven! Here may rich and poor meet, on a common level of mutual respect, and in the exercise of a common Christian hope, to worship the Lord who is the Maker of them all! Here may the young be safely guided and surely taught to remember their Creator in the days of their youth! Here may they of mature age find spiritual strength equal to their day of duty! Here may the aged pilgrim find abundant consolation and help! Here may parents and children rejoice together before God, the hearts of parents drawn to their children in heavenly love, and children looking to parents with respect and reverence! Here may pastor and people be bound together by faith and love, zealous alike to hold fast wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine which is according to godliness! May the line of religious, learned and earnest pastors over this church be extended for many generations to come! May they not seek dominion over the faith of this people, but be helpers of their spiritual joy! As in old time, may there still be *princes and great men* in this Israel! Here may religion, pure and undefiled before God, even the Father, safely dwell! Here may conscience ever find a peaceful asylum! May the Christianity here taught convince the understanding by its reasonableness; ad-

ressing in its purity the intellect, may it sway the heart by its moral power! Here may the religious education of the children of the poor prosper, and faith have a good foundation in knowledge! With young and old, may works follow faith, and Christian practice be the sweet fruit of religious profession! May the special services which in coming years the worshipers within these walls will attend, be followed by the manifest blessings of God's grace! Here may young persons of each sex, when entering on the tenderest of the domestic relations, plight their troth in purity of heart and with Christian love! May the heads of many united and happy households here learn the lesson that religion is the best, the only *sure*, foundation of domestic peace and enduring affection! Here may parents bring their children to enter them of the household of faith, and to plant them as goodly pillars in the Church of Christ! May an unbroken chain of witnesses here partake of the bread of faith and the cup of blessing, and the work of Christian communion not cease while the earth endures! Here may the mourner's broken heart be healed; and as God's saints are summoned above, may survivors not sorrow as those without hope, but rest their souls on the Rock of Ages, assured that what is sown in dishonour shall be raised in glory, and that they who have borne the image of the earthly, shall also bear the image of the heavenly! May generations yet to be born look back with a blessing on this day's work! May they reverently and joyfully tell to their children, and they to children's children, that their fathers who erected this house of prayer were labourers together with God, wise master-builders, men who built for eternity, on the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone! Amen and Amen!"

At the close of the sermon, a collection in aid of the Building Fund was made. At the close of the service, which had lasted about two hours and a half, a large proportion of the congregation adjourned to the Assembly-room at the Bath, which was suitably decorated for the occasion. The room, which will hold about 400 persons, was pretty well filled, and presented a very animated and agreeable appearance. A substantial collation was provided, for which the guests were well prepared by their morning's journeys and duties. The Divine blessing was supplicated



by Rev. John Gordon. The chair was taken by R. Heywood, Esq., of Bolton, who was supported by Mr. Crook, M.P., and many of the ministers present.

On opening the proceedings, the CHAIRMAN said he must congratulate the members of the Bank-Street congregation on the event of the day, and the happy occasion which had assembled them together, and gathered around them so many of their friends of other congregations. It was matter of rejoicing to them all that they had brought to completion the building in which they, and their children after them, were to meet for religious worship. For his own part, he could have been perfectly contented with the old chapel. To it he was very warmly attached. He had had the opportunity of frequenting worship in many places at home and abroad; he had witnessed in foreign lands sumptuous and imposing religious ceremonies; but these things made no impression on him; he parted with them without regret; and when he returned home, he came back to his accustomed house of prayer with fond delight. These were his own feelings; but when he found that others of the congregation were desirous of building a place of worship more in accordance with modern taste than the plain and respectable structure handed down to them by their fathers, he felt at once that it was right to acquiesce, and to give all the aid he could in completing the design of the congregation. Now that all was finished, he felt perfectly satisfied that they had done what was right in giving so much careful attention to, and expending their means upon, the house of God. If in some respects the situation of the chapel appeared to be unfavourable, he might fearlessly state that its interior did no discredit to the Protestant Dissent of Bolton. He trusted, too, that the time would come, and at no very distant period, when the hindrances to its outward appearance being all that they could wish would be removed, and their chapel would stand forth to public view a prominent and a graceful building. It was his earnest hope that in the new chapel the Bank-Street congregation would continue the career of harmony and Christian usefulness to which they had been accustomed, and that, having worshiped together while on earth, they might be permitted to meet hereafter and continue that worship in heaven. After these introductory remarks, the Chairman proposed

in suitable terms of loyal affection, "The Queen," and, without venturing to claim her as an Unitarian, said that it was impossible to avoid the conclusion that there were many religious sympathies between themselves and a Monarch who had given her marked sanction to the liberal sentiments and the practical and truly Christian doctrine contained in a sermon on the Religion of Common Life,—a sermon not preached by a dignitary of the Episcopal Church, but by a clergyman of the Presbyterian Establishment of Scotland, Mr. Caird.

The National Anthem was then sung by Miss Armstrong and the musical party from Manchester who had officiated in the choir in the morning's religious service, Mr. Rawson presiding at the pianoforte.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed, "The Rev. R. Brook Aspland, with our best thanks for the interesting and admirable sermon which he has preached to us to-day."

Mr. ASPLAND, in acknowledging the sentiment, said that he had felt it to be an honour, though one to which he had no title, to be selected to preach the first sermon in their new chapel. The honour had its attendant anxieties, and he had urged its transference from himself to some one of the more gifted and eloquent men whom he saw around and before him; but when the minister and those members of the congregation who had the arrangement of their opening service renewed their expressed wish that he should be the preacher, he felt it a duty to their common cause to acquiesce, and discharge the duty assigned him in the best way he could. And now, if they were satisfied, he was well rewarded. Being the first speaker unconnected with Bolton who had been called upon to address that large meeting, he must hasten, on behalf of himself and the numerous friends whom the occasion had mustered, to utter the voice of admiring congratulation on the great success of their new chapel. Amongst the numerous buildings of the kind erected by Unitarian congregations during the last fifteen years, he thought it might be regarded as one of the most successful. He could not speak with any authority, or with any pretension to exact knowledge of its conformity to the precise rules of art. Possibly the severe and critical eye of a professed architect might here and there

"hint a fault

And hesitate dislike;"

but of this he was sure, that for the end the congregation had in view they could not have erected a building more thoroughly convenient and beautiful. It seemed to him to combine in a very happy manner utility and grace, and while securing the fine solemnity of a church, had made no sacrifice of the convenience of the meeting-house. It was a most fitting expression of the bright and cheerful religion which they professed. The "religious light" of their house of prayer was in no respect "dim." He rejoiced in this, for as he advanced in life he felt more and more the need of light. Everywhere it was a pleasant thing for the eyes to behold the light of the sun, but especially in the house of Him who said, "Let there be light," and there was light. The internal arrangements of the chapel were a model of convenience. The minister could from the pulpit see nearly every member of that large flock, and every member of the congregation could both see and hear the preacher. He had listened with much interest to the sentiment of affection for the old chapel so well expressed by the Chairman. The interest felt in a house of prayer which had so long and instructive a history as that detailed by their pastor in the farewell sermons delivered in the old chapel, was only a becoming tribute to the memory of the good men who had successively ministered within its walls, as well as a natural expression of fond recollections and pious affections, excited by the remembrance of their own hours of worship and religious meditation in a place they had frequented from infancy to age. Pleasant as their associations with the past were, he rejoiced they had consented to sacrifice them to a sense of present duty. In their prosperous and rapidly-improving town, the several religious bodies were giving proof of zeal by erecting costly and striking temples, and it was not right for the most ancient form of Protestant Dissent to stand still. The eye and ear of the multitude were everywhere attracted to other forms of religious expression. It was a positive duty on the part of those who believed that they could in an inquiring and critical age best vindicate religion by proving and illustrating its reasonableness and its entire adaptation to man's nature and wants, to come forth from the retired and secluded spots selected in persecuting days as fit sites for houses of prayer, and boldly challenge the attention of

the great masses around them. If religion were to be protected from fanaticism and defended against infidelity, much of the work would have to be done by Unitarian Christians. He had recently been reading a somewhat secret page of ecclesiastical history, the contents of which being little known and having a local bearing, he would briefly mention. They were accustomed to regard the notorious sect of *Shakers* as an outbreak of *American* fanaticism. But the truth was that the town in which they were assembled had been the cradle of this singular sect. Rather more than a century ago, a poor tailor of Bolton, named James Wardley, who had been seeking spiritual rest without success amongst the Quakers, the French Prophets and other sects, started a new system of faith and worship, in which violent dancing and other vehement gesticulations were included. From Bolton he removed to Manchester, and founded a church of Shakers, the chief members of which were James Whittaker, of Oldham, and the family of one James Stanley, a blacksmith, residing in Toad Lane, in Manchester. A married daughter of this Stanley, named Ann Lees, became a very distinguished member of the church. The new sect, by their zeal and their peculiarities, attracted the attention of the authorities of Manchester. It would astonish them to learn how low the estimate of religious liberty was in Manchester some eighty years ago. The house in which these singular worshipers were assembled was surrounded by the warden of Manchester old church and the magistrates. They were commanded to put an end to their grotesque mode of worship, and refusing, were seized and conveyed to prison. Ann Lees, the elected "Mother of the Church," was—shame on the men and those times!—kept fourteen days in the town prison, and during the whole of that time had no nourishment beyond what was conveyed to her by her followers in the form of liquid, through the stem of a pipe passed through the keyhole. Driven by persecution, the Mother of the faithful emigrated to America, passing through some most singular adventures, and finally established her system on the other side of the Atlantic, where it still exists in very many of the States. Poor Wardley, left behind, sunk into obscurity and poverty, and died in the workhouse. Now the moral which he would draw from the story

was this. Supposing this poor Bolton tailor had, in the days of his earnest seeking after truth, been accidentally led into the Bank-Street chapel, and had the opportunity of listening to the sound, scriptural and rational instruction of Messrs. Buck and Dixon and Holland, his mind might have been protected from fanaticism, and the earnest zeal which he and his followers displayed might have been directed into a respectable and useful channel. These humble people would have been saved much misery, and made happy, and the church of Christ would have been spared one of the least creditable outbreaks of fanaticism and folly. The mention of some of the former ministers of Bolton reminded him of a long line of Christian men, whose services in behalf of Christian truth and righteousness entitled them to honourable recollection. It was with great pleasure that he saw his friend and former fellow-student, Mr. Baker, fulfilling with such eminent success the duties of the ministry to such a congregation. Most gratifying and enviable must be the feelings with which Mr. Baker surveyed the spacious and handsome chapel, erected for him by a zealous, attached and united flock. There were two circumstances which particularly struck him. It sometimes happened that after a long stage of duty, however faithfully performed, ministers lost their hold on the interest of a congregation sighing after novelty. It was not so with the pastor of the Bank-Street congregation. The noble fabric in which they had that morning worshiped was a testimonial of a people's confidence and attachment after a service of two-and-thirty years. Mr. Baker's flock, now happily united, contained all the Unitarians of Bolton. But it was not so when he settled in the town. In a former generation there were divisions which led to a considerable secession, which lasted for twenty years. It was indeed matter of congratulation that this was quite at an end. There was now no division in the ranks. The seceders, or their children, had cheerfully united in building the new chapel. There must have been on the part of the minister of the Bank-Street chapel, during the early years and middle portion of his ministry, great prudence, forbearance, and unquestionable tokens of the Christian spirit. He was entitled to, and this day received, the congratulations of his brother ministers on the happy result. Judging from the past, they ventured

to anticipate a useful and happy future, and all present would cordially join him in the sentiment which he now offered for the acceptance of the meeting:—"The Rev. Franklin Baker and the Bank-Street Congregation—may Pastor and People be long and increasingly united, prosperous and happy!" The sentiment was received with long-continued and enthusiastic applause.

REV. FRANKLIN BAKER said that he had not expected such a greeting, and was somewhat overpowered by it. It was true, as his old friend Mr. Aspland had proclaimed, that his ministry in Bolton had extended to upwards of thirty-two years. During such a length of service, omissions and shortcomings must have occurred. He deeply lamented them. But still he could look back with pride upon the general result of his labours. And no minister, perhaps, under the same circumstances, ever experienced fewer anxieties than he had done. This was chiefly owing to the character of the society itself, amongst whose members there existed not only a spirit of kindness and harmony, but a zealous attachment to their denominational views and opinions. Within his recollection, Unitarianism had not held its present position in Bolton. It had had its struggles here, as in other places—its contests with sectarian jealousies and popular odium; but, nothing daunted, the Unitarians of Bolton had been true to their sentiments in season and out of season, and especially on different public occasions they had not blinked their opinions. The consequence was, they had made them respected, and were now reaping the fruits of their consistency and honesty in the accessions which the congregation had received from other religious bodies.

The opening services that day brought forcibly before his mind two different periods of their history. He could not help picturing what was the state of feeling in the town when, after ten years of excitement, occasioned by the ejection and persecution of some of the best men in the Church, Nonconformity first ventured to rear its head in 1672, and take its place as one of the religious elements of society. At that time, in a town of probably about five or six thousand inhabitants, and when the parish church was the only religious edifice, the Presbyterians of Bolton opened their first meeting-house in Deansgate. It is true they were a numerous and influential body, for in



this part of the country the churches had nearly all been filled with Puritan divines. Two or three of these holy men, amongst whom was the ejected vicar, were the founders of the cause. They had sacrificed their livings and abandoned comfortable homes for the sake of conscience and the preservation of their religious liberties, and gave the residue of their days to the new congregation. Three of them ended their lives as pastors of the first meeting-house. The last, the Rev. Robert Seddon, seeing the want of a larger building, gave a piece of land, the site of the structure in which they had worshiped that day. It was his last act—and long may it celebrate his name!

In 1695, the next great era in their history, the congregation removed from Deansgate into Bank Street. There its first minister, a nephew of the last, though he had not been ejected, had refused to subscribe the oaths and articles required for his degree, and commenced his ministerial life in the true spirit of a Nonconformist. What his religious opinions were, and what were the opinions of his predecessors, this was not the time to discuss. Probably Calvinism gave way to Arianism, which in its turn was succeeded by Unitarian views. In the space of the two centuries which had nearly elapsed from the foundation of Dissent in Bolton, those mutations and changes had been going on which marked the progress of opinion in other parts. He did not contend that the views they now held embodied all religious truth. Far from it. All he said was, that, such as they were, they were conscientiously held and honestly avowed. The consistency of their forefathers had helped to place them in the high position taken by the body in the town. The congregation had erected the handsome building in which they had worshiped that day for the first time, without extraneous aid. Upwards of £3000 had been subscribed for the purpose in little more than a week; and though a deficiency of a few hundreds would remain, they did not intend to appeal to the public for contributions, and he had no doubt that a few months would see it cleared away.

When he (Mr. Baker) first became acquainted with the town, there was much bigotry in it, especially amongst some of what are called the orthodox sects. He had had personally little experience of it, but nevertheless its manifestations were not to be mistaken. Much of this had disappeared, and he

dwelt with pride upon the altered state of feeling. Amongst the Independent Dissenters, the change was very striking. One of their ministers would probably have been with them on that occasion, if he had not been suddenly summoned in another direction. From another of them, who had been present at the services in the morning, he had received a very kind letter, expressing his willingness to have joined their meeting in the afternoon, but from an apprehension lest his presence might be misinterpreted, and act as a restriction on the denominational tone which such meetings properly took. He (Mr. Baker) trusted that the same catholicity of feeling would ever be manifested by his congregation towards all men. To be zealous for their own opinions and tolerant of those of others, appeared to him to combine the principle of Christian liberty. He thanked them for the patience with which he had been listened to, and would only add, should his life be spared still to labour amongst them, his most earnest wish and hope that they would all co-operate with him in disseminating what he believed to be the great and living truths of Unitarian Christianity.

A quartet, entitled "The Chapel," was then sung by the choir.

The CHAIRMAN then proposed "Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over."

Rev. J. PANTON HAM, in responding, offered his congratulations for their auspicious gathering, and dwelt upon the magnitude of the subject of the sentiment which he had been called upon to speak to, which had his entire sympathy. He urged upon their body the necessity of increased zeal to make head against those fashionable influences (antagonistic to true religion) by which they were surrounded, and by which so many were drafted off. He was glad to see that they were disposed to come boldly before society in this town. There was, however, a want of sympathy with their denomination amongst those around them. The reason was, they had no social or religious influence; they should unite themselves more in a body, be allied more closely together, and shew something like denominational action, if they would assume their proper position. There was good in individuality in congregations at times, but this might be pushed to extremity. He (Mr. H.) threw out a hint as to the propriety of holding an autumnal meeting of their

body at some place, to which each congregation should send a minister as their representative. The Unitarians, he considered, were the only consistent people, as a denomination, in reference to civil and religious liberty. The Independents were a body who did not properly understand what civil and religious liberty was. When among them, the moment he avowed his own convictions, a hue and cry was raised against him. When his congregation was in a rising condition, he was ejected from them, and no longer recognized as a brother, upon the enunciation of his opinions respecting the dogma of eternal torment. Out of a congregation of 650 persons, all went with him but 27. He declared his belief that they (the Unitarians) were the people who alone understood civil and religious liberty, and it was their mission to circulate this liberty, and make it properly understood in this country.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed, "Unitarian Christianity—Life as well as Doctrine—may its influence be felt in purifying the affections and in enlightening the understanding."

Rev. CHARLES BEARD said he wished so important a sentiment had been placed in the hands of some older and more experienced person than himself—one who had already proved by his life his attachment to Unitarian Christianity. But he found his consolation in the thought that his very youth afforded him, if so God pleased, more years and more strength to labour in a cause in attachment to which he yielded to none. He had no little sympathy with the devotion and affection towards the Church of England which were often expressed by members of her communion. They justly felt that they owed much, religiously, to the associations and memories connected with that member of Christ's visible body from which they had derived their early faith. And surely an Unitarian Christian ought to feel this attachment to his church in a manner peculiarly deep and intense. For it was a church which, while supplying to him every motive to the love of God and the service of man, imposed on him in return no shackles, but asked of him only that he should seek truth and do right wherever and whenever it seemed to his own conscience desirable.

The speaker went on to say, that he had lately heard the sentiment now placed in his hands, expressed in a briefer and more homely phrase. An

intimate friend of his own, who had been born and bred an Unitarian, had the misfortune to differ, on an important social question, with a near relation who had never altogether shaken off the effects of an early Calvinistic training. And the remark which his friend had made was, "Ah! it's a *great start* to have been born an Unitarian." Now this *great start* was the fact which he was about to state and exemplify.

And, first, of the Unitarian life. Thank God! the spirit is not confined in its operations to any single church; by a wonderful dispensation of Providence, for which it was impossible to be too grateful, there were saints in every church, and none could claim a monopoly of holiness. He should grieve were it not so. It would be enough to shew, then, that Unitarian Christianity was not less efficient than any other form of our blessed religion in producing the fruits of the spirit. And this might be proved to demonstration. It would be admitted that a true test of the reality and efficacy of a man's religion might be found in the fact that it leavened his whole life—that it had a specific effect upon him, not only as a man, but as a citizen and a politician. Now it was a remarkable thing that while other sects were politically and socially divided, so that a man's religious denomination was no key to the manner of his public action, the Unitarian body was always on one side. With few and unimportant exceptions, arising from peculiar circumstances, and so few as to make the general fact more striking, all Unitarians belonged to the party of Progress. They were all ready to contend fearlessly for the true and the right wherever they were to be found. How many Unitarians were opponents of Parliamentary Reform? or the Emancipation of Trade? or Religious Equality? or Popular Education? or Criminal Reform? and that not only in prosperous times like the present, but in days when to be a reformer was a dangerous thing? And to this fact, for fact it was, he fearlessly pointed as a proof that the habits of thought and tone of morality inculcated in Unitarian churches had a very specific effect upon the Unitarian life. For the value of a man's religion lies in its power to make something of him, and it is a good religion that makes good citizens.

But, again, some such facts as the foregoing were indeed admitted by our orthodox fellow-believers. They say

to us, "We allow you to be good, moral men, exemplary in your domestic and social and political relations, upright in business, benevolent, public-spirited. But beyond and above these virtues of the unregenerate heart, you want those more recondite and mysterious excellences which are the product of divine grace alone; failing which, we can look upon you only as in the outer court of the temple." Let us accept the admission, and apply to it the gospel rule, that the tree be known by its fruits. It is surely praise enough to say of Unitarians that publicly and privately they do their duty. Would that such praise might be justified by the event! For there is no more irreversible truth than this—that whatever church does Christ's work is Christ's, whatever name it may bear; and that howsoever rejected by men, it will finally be owned by Him.

And, secondly, of Unitarian doctrine. What was it? it might be scoffingly asked. That was not the place to attempt a definition of it, nor was a definition needful; for however Unitarians might differ among themselves—and they did not hide or make the least of their differences—they were separated by a far wider interval from even those of their orthodox fellow-christians who made the nearest approach to them. But what were the prospects of Unitarian doctrine? The Unitarianism of the day was twofold—acknowledged and unacknowledged. There were the avowed Unitarian churches—few and small, yet not uninfluential: there was the Unitarian tone of thought, powerfully leavening almost every so-called orthodox church. And it was not any self-deceiving attempt at consolation which made us think this to be the fact: our opponents, as might be seen in the last No. of the *British Quarterly Review*, acknowledged it as fully as we. What, then, are the duties of the acknowledged holders of Unitarian opinions towards those who in other religious communions appear substantially to agree with them? It is above all things necessary to remember the peculiarities of their position. It appears to us, beyond doubt, absolutely illogical and indefensible. Were it not for the spotless character, the high moral feeling, of many distinguished Churchmen, e.g. Dr. Arnold and Mr. Maurice, whose doctrinal opinions, as expressed in their works, appear altogether irreconcilable with the Church's formulae, we could not believe them honest.

Yet the supposition of deliberate dishonesty is not for a moment tenable. They have arrived at their present position by a path of their own, and we must leave it to their love of truth and integrity to lead them on to a firmer ground. At the same time, the obligation distinctly lies upon us of maintaining, defending and expressing our own opinions in the clearest and firmest manner possible. We have no right to hide our candle under a bushel. The high office has been allotted to us of presenting to our age and country the spectacle of a church which is not afraid to make its words the precise exponents of its thought. And doubtless we shall thus be enabled to erect a beacon which shall finally avail to guide these long-tossed wanderers on the theological waste of waters into a safe and happy haven of honest and outspoken conviction.

And, in the last place, this as well as other indications shewed that the triumph of Unitarian Christianity was near at hand. The speaker was not one who loved to indulge the peculiarly Unitarian habit of grumbling, for which that day and place were surely not suited: Unitarianism had sat by the wayside, counting its sores, long enough. But he would try to express in a parable what might be the ultimate destiny of our religious organization. Arnold von Winkelried, leader of a band of patriotic Switzers, was encountered one day, in open field of battle, by an impenetrable phalanx of Austrian spears, far outnumbering his own devoted troops. There was no visible point of attack: the long array of pikes menaced on every hand. Calling upon his comrades to follow him manfully, he embraced within his arms as many of the enemy's points as he could, and buried them in his own bosom, falling dead of many mortal wounds. But over his body, and into the breach which he had made, rushed his fellow-soldiers, and struck, as brave men strike for God and country, till the day was their own. And so it is possible that we may dash ourselves, through years yet to come, against the serried ranks of the enemies of religious freedom, till our own communion almost—if so it please God—perish in the constant struggle. But what of that? If we fall, it is only that Truth and Liberty may conquer; and to despair of *their* final victory is to despair of God!

The CHAIRMAN, in proposing "The True Free Church of Scotland," called upon the Rev. J. Gordon to respond.

Rev. J. GORDON.—I have been re-



quested to say a few words on the subject of "The True Free Church of Scotland." I might expatiate on this subject for an indefinite length of time, for it immediately conducts me into the regions of imagination. There is no religious body to which this title can be properly given. It expresses what we hope for, not what we have. There is indeed a religious body which calls itself the Free Church of Scotland, and I suppose I am expected especially to allude to its character and position; but in doing so I shall be obliged to deny that the freedom by which it is distinguished is true freedom. In some respects it would be almost impossible to speak too highly of this Church. The religious zeal, for instance, which animates its members, is worthy of all commendation, and presents itself to observation in most striking forms; but the liberty cultivated bears no proportion whatever to the energy displayed.

The real character of this Church can scarcely be better indicated than by contrasting the circumstances of its origin with those which gave rise to your own English Presbyterianism. Both these ecclesiastical movements sprung from separations in national churches. English Presbyterianism was produced by an ejectionment from the English Establishment, and Scotch Free-churchism by a disruption of the Scotch Establishment. There was, however, this wide difference between the two movements,—that the English one was necessitated by freedom of conscience, while the Scotch one was mainly an assertion of religious authority. Your Presbyterian founders left the Church of England because they would not subscribe to what they did not believe; but no such subscription as this was required from the founders of the Free Church of Scotland: they were merely expected to submit to a method of ministerial appointment inconsistent with their party purposes. Under the powerful influence of Dr. Chalmers, the Evangelical, as distinguished from the Moderate, party in the Kirk had risen to great power, and it was attempted to secure to the Presbyteries an unqualified veto upon the settlement of ministers, and thus to prepare the way for the supremacy of that party in all cases of such settlement. The State refused to give up the supply of the pulpits thus entirely into the hands of a dominant portion of the clergy; and being prevented from accomplishing their exclusive purposes

within the old body, this Evangelical party formed themselves into a new body. Of course it came to pass that the exclusive spirit which gave birth to "the Free Church" presided over its constitution and administration, and both doctrinally and ecclesiastically the enforcement of a strict uniformity, as opposed to everything like *true* Freedom, has been among the most marked features of that Church. Perhaps an English audience would gain the most distinct idea of the Free Church of Scotland from a comparison which may be instituted between it and Wesleyan Methodism. If you can conceive of the Wesleyan community, with its priestly domination, its narrow intelligence, and its fanatical excitements, saturated with Calvinism of the darkest hue, then you may have no incorrect idea of the Church now under our notice.

Its success has been almost unexampled. It has planted chapels and schools over the whole face of the country; it has drawn forth pecuniary liberality to an extent quite incredible in anticipation; and it absorbs the greater part of the earnest religion of the people. Its action upon the National Church and upon the other ecclesiastical bodies of Scotland has been strongly in favour of a revival of Evangelical sentiment, so that there is in that portion of the island, at the present time, a similarity of administration answering to this type which affords one of the most notable signs of our time.

You are not to suppose that this outward appearance of things fully expresses the real religious condition of the people. I suppose that a disbelief of orthodoxy nowhere more extensively prevails than it does in Scotland. You meet with constant indications that what is publicly professed is not generally believed. But the disbelief is concealed—more so there than elsewhere. The strong Church influence exerted prevents its open acknowledgment to an unprecedented degree; and the natural consequence of this secret alienation is, that what might otherwise fix itself in an attachment to a liberal form of Christianity, degenerates into a rejection of Christianity. I am persuaded that there is, in this boasted stronghold of Calvinism, more of confirmed infidelity than can almost anywhere else be found.

I have made these observations as introductory to a view of religious mat-

ters in Scotland which I think demands your serious notice. I wish to bring what I have said to bear upon certain tendencies of religious thought and feeling with which you in England are connected. If we look back and inquire what the state of theological opinion in Scotland was seventy years ago, we are met with the fact that at that time heresy, principally in its Arian form, had spread through the length and breadth of the land. A very considerable number of the pulpits of the Establishment were then occupied by men who had substantially rejected the peculiarities of orthodoxy. Now how did it come to pass that, in spite of what we conceive to be the truth of the subject, this influence should have ceased to operate? How did it come to pass that the tide should have been so completely turned as it has been, and an entire change back to the administration of the most rigid Calvinism should have taken place? Mark well the answer, for it most intimately concerns you. The cause of the change is to be sought for in the fact, that the liberal views of Christianity adopted were contrary to the doctrines subscribed. These heretical preachers had all signed the Westminster Confession, and held their situations by virtue of such signature. There was a lamentable opposition between the opinions they entertained and the opinions they had bound themselves to promote. I do not wish to indulge in hard reflections upon the men who stood in this awkward position. They could plead much excuse for it, and there are ways in which they attempted to reconcile it to their consciences. This case does not now present itself to me as a question of character, but as a question of influence. When sincere and earnest men like Dr. Chalmers arose, who based their operations upon a consistent interpretation of the orthodox theory of redemption, they had an advantage in the existing creed of their Church which was irresistible. They could appeal not only to the arguments by which their belief was supported, but also to the sense of fidelity and honour on the part of those who equally with themselves had given their assent to that belief. It was a contest between integrity and equivocation, and in that unequal strife the moral element prevailed, as it ought to do. It was far better for men to reinstate a rejected opinion, than it was for them to maintain a dishonest attitude. Nor was

this all. Debarred by their circumstances from defending their heretical notions on Christian grounds,—obliged to be silent where these notions required a direct exposure of orthodox dogmas,—the liberal party in the Church for the most part confined their expositions to what could be supported on merely natural grounds. Distinctively Christian sanctions and motives gave place in their teaching to ethical reasoning, and by this means the religion as well as the Christianity of that teaching was injuriously affected. When, therefore, their day of trial came, it was found that the house they had built was without proper foundation. It rested upon no rock of gospel truth, and was therefore easily swept away by the force exerted against it. This destitution of the Christian element in the administration of which I am speaking, will account not only for its want of success in opposition to an Evangelical orthodoxy, but also for that proneness to infidelity which distinguishes the Scotch refusals to accept an orthodox faith.

You hear people saying that it is of little matter what open professions are made, provided the principles of liberal thought actually prevail; and the spread of Unitarian sentiments among bodies nominally Trinitarian, is a cause of even greater congratulation than their spread in an acknowledged form would be. It seems to be considered that all the work necessary to a religious reformation is to shake the existing orthodox belief,—that men may be led to withdraw their assent from that which their public creed expresses. I entirely dissent from this judgment. I do so on the ground of historical fact. This Scotch case is a remarkable one in my favour; but every other case possessing the same elements bears the same character and teaches the same lesson. No religious reformation can exert its legitimate influence, or can securely hold its own, which is not commended by truth and honesty before men. It must be free from moral stain, or it will be destitute of moral power. These two evils which I have traced, and which in Scotland have produced an entire defeat of the liberal efforts that so remarkably distinguished the last generation, are not accidental, but inherent in the subject. Wherever the condition of things in favour of heterodox views is such as existed there, they will assuredly appear and work as they have there done. On the

one hand, when the heterodoxy promoted is contrary to the subscription publicly made, it will always lie open to orthodox zeal to revive the dying faith on the ground of moral consistency; and events will be sure to afford opportunity for the full effect of that zeal. On the other hand, a subscription to an orthodox scheme of Christianity forbids that reconciliation of heterodox opinion with Christian truth which will alone avail to its efficient support; and in the time of attack it will be found destitute of those means of defence which are necessary to its retention in the position it has assumed. In one word, a liberal Christianity thus unfortunately circumstanced, is at once unprotected on the side of Right, and undermined on the side of Truth.

You will, I hope, see from these remarks how important that small Scotch Unitarian interest is with which I am connected. We are few in numbers and weak in influence, but we occupy a position than which there is none more responsible in the three kingdoms. We stand alone as the avowed supporters of views which, on their negative side at least, are entertained by a vast number of persons whom the revived Calvinistic energy of the day frightens into submission. England is divided and subdivided into all classes of religious profession; but Scotland is almost undivided in the profession of orthodoxy. Our little band has to withstand this more united opposition, in the knowledge that multitudes who shew us no countenance, yet sympathize with us in their hearts. There are here and there instances of liberal administration, especially in the Established Church, which might give us hope, if it were not for the manifest inconsistency attaching to them: but we cannot but believe that what has prevented the expected benefits in days gone by, will prevent them in days to come. Our dependance, therefore, so far from resting upon anything of this kind, rests upon the exposure to shame of everything of this kind, by its contrast with our own fidelity and earnestness. Could we but be the means of calling out the latent sympathy of which I have spoken into open and honest expression, we should have means of prosperity at our command with which few others could be compared; and the native strength, and religious tendency, and Christian training, and Protestant feeling of the Scotch character, would give to that prosper-

ity, if it should ever occur, a depth of interest altogether peculiar to itself.

The CHAIRMAN then gave "The Congregations of our Body and their Ministers—may they continue to maintain those principles which have placed them amongst the foremost advocates of religious truth and freedom!"

Dr. BEARD said he would not have ventured to speak that evening, if he did not wish to express his delight at their success that day, and to congratulate them upon the result of their noble effort to erect their new chapel. He was proud in being a Unitarian; but if he thought they were lacking in religious duty, he should not feel that pride. The Doctor paid a tribute of respect to the Chairman for his conduct through life, designating the class to which he belonged as having been a much-misunderstood and shamefully-persecuted one, and a class from which much good had come. Talk of Unitarians being inconsiderable! it was all imagination. Suppose the Unitarians could disappear from the midst of the population of Bolton, Manchester, Bury and other towns, he believed that it would be the greatest calamity that ever happened, politically and religiously. The speaker then complimented the Rev. Mr. Baker upon the fact that, after a thirty-two years' administration, himself and his congregation should have been able to rear such an edifice as that which had been opened that day.

The CHAIRMAN proposed "The Removal of all Obstructions to the Freedom of Religion. May the efforts of those Legislators whose labours are directed to such wise ends be crowned with success!"

J. CROOK, Esq., M.P., on responding, was received with cheers. He said the sentiment had the largest claims upon his sympathy. In this country men had ceased to suffer, personally and pecuniarily, for matters of opinion; and he rejoiced at the progress that had been made within the last thirty years; they had now men participating in all the municipal honours of the town. Mr. Crook then alluded to those measures affecting Dissenters which had been brought before Parliament, and said that though some of these had failed, they were in the hands of able men, who would do justice to the questions they had taken up. He deprecated the controlling power of the State Church as to matters of faith and doctrine; expressed a hope that the question of church-rates would be speedily settled; and made allusion to the measure for admitting



Dissenters to the Universities having made some progress in Parliament. The hon. Member touched upon other Bills which had been discussed by the Legislature; and, after a few words in favour of the sentiment, gave—"Mr. Heywood, Chairman of the Building Committee."

Mr. HEYWOOD briefly replied, stating that his efforts had been directed to secure as much light as possible in the new edifice, and expressing his perfect satisfaction with the proceedings of that day. He proposed "The Committees, Architect, Contractors, and all who have lent their active assistance in the completion of the work we are met to celebrate."

Rev. F. BAKER proposed an acknowledgment of gratitude to the friends who had come from a distance to visit them that day, coupling with it the name of the Rev. Joseph Ashton, of Preston.—The Rev. gentleman acknowledged the compliment, and the meeting separated.

On Sunday, Aug. 24th, the 194th anniversary of that black Bartholomew-day which drove two thousand and upward conscientious clergymen from their livings, the Bank-Street congregation re-assembled in their new chapel. There were throughout the day very large congregations. In addition to many of their neighbours of other religious denominations, there were present, Mr. R. T. Heap and Mr. Wood, of Rochdale; Messrs. John and Thomas Grundy, of Bury; Messrs. W. Evans, J. B. Harrison, John and William Shawcross, G. Ainsworth and B. D. Naylor, of Manchester; and, in addition to the minister of the congregation and the officiating ministers, there were present, Rev. James Martineau, Rev. J. H. Thom, Rev. James Bayley and Rev. John Cropper. The religious service of the morning was conducted by the Rev. John Gordon, of Edinburgh. He took as his text Revel. ii. 1-5, and dwelt, in a sermon remarkable for its clearness of statement, the force of its logic and the eloquence of its style, on the services and sufferings of the clergy of whose costly Nonconformity they were celebrating the anniversary. As the sermon was in great part repeated a few days after at Birmingham, and is about to appear in print, at the request of the members of the Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society, we will not attempt at present to give any detailed account of it. The service appropriately closed with the fine hymn, by the late Mr. Johns, in which mention is made of

"The deep and reverential debt

We owe to those of old,  
Who bore unstain'd through fire and flood

Redemption's ark, and with their blood  
Bought rights too dear for gold."

In the afternoon, the chapel was densely crowded, and to a deeply-attentive audience the Rev. J. P. Ham addressed an admirable sermon, from John iv. 20-24, of which we give a brief outline:

"I might invite you to contemplate this passage in its aspect towards that great fundamental point of difference which distinguishes you as a Christian congregation from the rest of your brethren. That God is one, and that worship is due to Him only, is so plainly the sentiment of this language of our Lord's, that I need scarcely do more than indicate it as one of the proof passages supplied by the discourses of Christ in support of your rational and scriptural position. It may be important to remind you that a more than usual emphasis may be put on this passage, not only as coming from the lips of Jesus himself, but because it specially distinguishes whom Jesus calls 'the true worshipers,' and describes the characteristics and quality of their worship. 'The true worshipers worship *the Father* in spirit and in truth.' 'The Father' is the one exclusive Object of true and acceptable worship, and He is to be worshiped 'in spirit and in truth,' because He is 'a Spirit.' 'God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' However applicable the term 'Spirit' may be to the doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ, it can scarcely, with candour, be contended that, as employed in the passage before us, it may be said of him that *he* is a Spirit. The term 'Spirit' here marks a peculiarity in the Divine Nature—'whom no man hath seen or can see,' except by spiritual perception; it distinguishes a Being, after whom,—to adopt the expressive term of a sacred writer,—we may 'feel' by the subtle touch of our spiritual instincts and sensibilities, but otherwise can have no knowledge of, or intercourse with Him. In such a sense the term 'Spirit' is not applicable to the Lord Jesus Christ, and yet upon the fact that 'God is a Spirit,' in this sense, our Lord establishes the Divine claim to a worship 'in spirit and in truth.' This high and perfect worship is represented by

Christ as due to God, because He is a Spirit. Will our brethren allow, with the divines of Rome, that there is a distinction in worship,—*latría* and *dulia*—a higher and inferior kind,—and be content that the *latría* or highest worship shall be paid to the Father only? They will not; their doctrine of Trinity in Unity forbids it. But does not Jesus Christ's doctrine, that the Father is to be worshiped in spirit and in truth *because* God is a Spirit, forbid that this high and perfect worship shall be paid to any other than the Father, because no other than the Father is 'a Spirit' in the sense in which Christ uses this term in our text? If the human theology of the churches forbids the one, the divine theology of Jesus Christ forbids the other."

The sermon, however, was less engaged with the controversial theology of the text, than with the exposition and enforcement of its testimony in behalf of a spiritual and catholic worship, in opposition to a worship that was local and ceremonial. The antithesis marked in the expressions, "in this mountain and in Jerusalem," and "in spirit and in truth," constituted the more special theme of the discourse. On this point it was remarked,—

"No doctrine of God and his worship was farther from their apprehension and sympathies than this of Christ's. Their ideas of God and the service due to Him were inseparable from what could be seen and handled. Apart from material manifestations and the appointments of time and place, worship to them was neither natural nor possible. They asked for 'the patterns of things in the heavens,'—the outward and visible signs of the spiritual and eternal, as indispensable to their religious life and growth. Hence their godliness lived in sacred days and new moons and solemn feast-times,—was nourished by rituals and located in temples. You can imagine how revolutionary was Christ's doctrine of God and His worship in the view of such a people as the Jews. To their demand for signs and forms, he replied by doctrines of 'spirit and life.' He superseded shadows with the substance of things, and mere resemblances with living realities. It was a vast stride which he bade them take from the earthly to the heavenly,—a long and laborious look from the things which were seen and temporal to those which were unseen and eternal. They were not prepared for so mighty a widening

of the temple, and so lofty an elevation for the throne of God. They could not follow Jehovah from time and place into the eternity and infinitude of His own essential being; and to separate His worship from the 'carnal ordinances' of the 'worldly sanctuary,' was like an abolition of all worship together,—the writing of Ichabod on the very frontlet of their faith. But all this Christ required, and declared should be. 'The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.' The truest recognition of God, and the worship most worthy of Him, could never be attained through the mediatorial agencies of mechanical symbolism and artificial forms. All that was merely ritualistic and local must gradually fall away. Faith and worship must detach themselves from everything material, would they rise above the restrictions of time and place, and soar into the infinite and towards the absolute. It must not be 'in this mountain' nor yet 'in Jerusalem,' but 'in spirit and in truth,' that the true worshippers must worship the Father. It is in the antithesis of these two expressions that the sense of the text comes out. The one side marks the ritualistic and local,—'in this mountain' and 'in Jerusalem;'—the other, the spiritual and universal,—'in spirit and in truth.' The one marks the childhood, the other the manhood, of religious culture and life. Temples and rites and priests, and all the artificial adjuncts of a carnal ecclesiasticism, are the offspring of the one; out of the other arise the goodly fabrics of living temples, men and women whose hearts are the throne of the Holy Spirit of God, and whose lives are a perpetual sacrifice to truth and virtue—'a royal priesthood' after the anointing of Christ, 'the High Priest of their profession.' The true idea of these words, 'in spirit and in truth,' is thus clearly pointed out by the contrast of the expression, 'in this mountain' and 'in Jerusalem.' Let us cherish it among the golden sentiments of the greatest and divinest of God's chosen teachers, and bind it around our hearts as the best revelation of God and human duty."

The application of the sermon to the occasion of its delivering, is shewn in the following, amongst its concluding remarks:

"If we are naturally, perhaps necessarily, borne onward by the tide of civilization and refinement, so that



every aspect of our social life,—our most secular and sacred life, if I may make such a distinction,—must take the impress and spread out the signs of the common progress, let all this be consistent with the social vitality and health. \* \* \* If a more luxurious age, like that in which we live, demands a more luxurious religion—if, in its growingly magnificent mood, it asks for greater external refinement and beauty in the forms and aspects of its worship, care must be taken that, while we yield to the spirit and wants of the age, Religion suffer not under her new circumstances. If she must shake herself from the dust of her ancient rudeness, and put on the beautiful garments of more tasteful forms, let her do so; but let her more than ever assert her own native excellence and worth above the adventitious circumstance of mere outward and variable forms. Let her shew herself independent of those forms, indeed of all form, save the moral and spiritual forms in which she ever expresses herself most naturally and moves most freely among mankind, and the rigidest Puritan taste will have no reason to complain of the accidents of this or any other age. No doubt it is well to be reminded that taste, even in spiritual, no less than in material things, has its temptations and is liable to extravagance and perversion. They who incline to the æsthetic direction will bear to be told that they have need of a sounder judgment and greater spiritual watchfulness, as well as a more exalted and earnest piety, than the rest of their fellow-worshippers. It will remain with such to prove—and I am reminded while standing in this tasteful ecclesiastical structure that I must include you, my friends, among the number whose duty it is to prove—that it is possible to worship ‘in this mountain’ and ‘in Jerusalem,’ without in the least endangering the worship ‘in spirit and in truth.’ You will permit me to impress on your minds the very

serious instruction of the text—to remind you that our great Teacher here lays the axe at the root of all localizing tendencies in the worship of God, and insists on the utmost naturalness and simplicity as chiefly compatible with the catholic and independent worship ‘in spirit and in truth.’ You have shewn that you appreciate the material wants of this more elegant age, and that you have not been unwilling to minister to those wants. This handsome and commodious church, an ornament both to your town and denomination, is an evidence of this. Give us good proof that you understand its moral and religious wants, by devoting yourselves, as a part of the living church, to the work of its emancipation from all that is artificial and false in its social and spiritual life, and from all that is unchristian and corrupt in its speculative and doctrinal teaching. Illustrate in your own individual and congregational character the distinguishing features of such as the Father seeketh to worship Him,—the characteristics of ‘the true worshipers who worship the Father in spirit and in truth.’”

In the evening, the religious service was conducted by Rev. R. B. Aspland, who expounded the Lord’s Prayer as the true model of Christian worship, and shewed its beautiful congeniality in word and thought with Unitarian Christianity, and its thorough antagonism to the peculiar doctrines of Orthodoxy.—The collections made after the four services of Thursday and Sunday amounted to £202. 17s. 7d., and that sum has been increased by subsequent donations.—Since the opening services, the congregations have been very large. The members of the Bank-Street society feel the deepest interest and satisfaction in the accomplishment of the great change in their place of worship. It is not a mere enthusiasm for novelty, but a sober and well-founded conviction, which augurs well for the stability and permanence of the Unitarian interest in Bolton.

---

## MARRIAGES.

Aug. 28, in the meeting-house of the First Presbyterian congregation, Belfast, by the father of the bride, ALEXANDER O'DRISCOLL TAYLOR, Esq., second son of John Taylor, Esq., of Glasgow, Manager of the Western Bank of Scotland, to ISABELLA, eldest daughter of the Rev. J. Scott PORTER, Belfast.

Sept. 6, at St. Mary's church, Marylebone, London, by Rev. J. Lovett Cameron, M.A., Rector of Buckhorn Weston, Dorsetshire, ROBERT NEEDHAM PHILIPS, Esq., of the Park, Manchester, to MARY ELLEN, second daughter of John Ashton YATES, Esq., of Bryanstone Square, London.